arXiv:1406.5086v4 [hep-th] 5 Oct 2014

Field-Dependent BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian Transformations

Pavel Yu. Moshin[a*] and Alexander A. Reshetnyak[b,c‡]
[a] *Department of Physics, Tomsk State University, 634050, Tomsk, Russia,*
[b] *Institute of Strength Physics and Materials Science,*
Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, 634021, Tomsk, Russia,
[c] *Tomsk State Pedagogical University, 634061, Tomsk, Russia*

October 7, 2014

Abstract

We continue our study of finite BRST-antiBRST transformations for general gauge theories in Lagrangian formalism, initiated in [arXiv:1405.0790[hep-th] and arXiv:1406.0179[hep-th]], with a doublet λ_a, $a = 1, 2$, of anticommuting Grassmann parameters and prove the correctness of the explicit Jacobian in the partition function announced in [arXiv:1406.0179[hep-th]], which corresponds to a change of variables with functionally-dependent parameters $\lambda_a = U_a\Lambda$ induced by a finite Bosonic functional $\Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda)$ and by the anticommuting generators U_a of BRST-antiBRST transformations in the space of fields ϕ and auxiliary variables π^a, λ. We obtain a Ward identity depending on the field-dependent parameters λ_a and study the problem of gauge dependence, including the case of Yang–Mills theories. We examine a formulation with BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking terms, additively introduced to the quantum action constructed by the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian rules, obtain the Ward identity and investigate the gauge-independence of the corresponding generating functional of Green's functions. A formulation with BRST symmetry breaking terms is developed. It is argued that the gauge independence of the above generating functionals is fulfilled in the BRST and BRST-antiBRST settings. These concepts are applied to the average effective action in Yang–Mills theories within the functional renormalization group approach.

Keywords: general gauge theory, BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian quantization, field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations, Yang–Mills theory, average effective action, BRST and BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking

1 Introduction

In our recent works [1, 2, 3], we have proposed an extension of BRST-antiBRST transformations to the case of finite (global and field-dependent) parameters for Yang–Mills and general gauge theories within the BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian [4, 5, 6] and generalized Hamiltonian [7, 8] quantization schemes; see also [9]. The notion of "finiteness" employs the inclusion into finite transformations of a new term, being quadratic in the parameters μ_a. First of all, this makes it possible to realize the complete BRST-antiBRST invariance of the integrand in the vacuum functional. Second, the functionally-dependent parameters $\lambda_a = s_a\Lambda$, induced by a Bosonic functional Λ, provide an explicit correspondence (due to the compensation equation for the corresponding Jacobian) between a choice of Λ and a transition from the partition function of a theory in a certain gauge, determined by a Bosonic gauge functional F_0, to the same theory in a different gauge, given by another gauge Boson F. This becomes a key instrument of a

*moshin@rambler.ru †reshet@ispms.tsc.ru

BRST-antiBRST approach that allows one to determine the Gribov horizon functional [10] – which is initially given by the Landau gauge in the Gribov–Zwanziger theory [11] – by using any other gauge, including the R_ξ-gauges, eliminating residual gauge invariance in the deep IR region. In this respect, it should be noted that we do not consider here, and have not considered earlier in [1, 2, 3], the case of BRST [12, 13] and antiBRST transformations with one and the same anticommuting Grassmann parameter $\mu = \delta\Lambda$, as suggested in the first paper [14] devoted to finite BRST transformations (see Eqs. (2.3a), (2.3b) therein) in the infinitesimal and finite forms for the global and field-dependent cases in Yang–Mills theories. In fact, such considerations are in conflict with the ghost number distribution used in [1, 4, 5] for field variables and also contradict to the standard definition of BRST-antiBRST symmetry transformations [15, 16, 17], which implies the presence in BRST transformed fields of a Grassmann-odd parameter μ and an independent Grassmann-odd parameter for antiBRST transformed fields, $\bar{\mu}$, with the ghost number opposite to that of μ.[1] Second, our consideration is based on special global two-parametric supersymmetries, realized on equal footing in [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. At the same time, finite field-dependent BRST and antiBRST transformations in Yang–Mills theories and reducible gauge theories with Abelian gauge groups have been recently examined in [18, 19] using a different scheme at different stages of quantization, whereas the so-called finite "mixed BRST-antiBRST transformations" – by the terminology of [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] for BRST-antiBRST transformations; see (3.7) in [19] – do not contain the polynomial term $\Theta_1\Theta_2 \neq 0$, thus affecting the "finiteness" of such finite BRST-antiBRST transformations. In fact, this eliminates the capability of such finite BRST-antiBRST transformations to provide symmetry transformations such that would relate the partition function of a gauge theory in one gauge to the same theory in another gauge within perturbation theory. Instead, by making a change of variables related to such field-dependent transformations in the vacuum functional (even in Abelian gauge theories), one cannot preserve the quantum action of a given theory and to obtain this theory in another gauge, thus making impossible the gauge independence of the vacuum functional and of the physical S-matrix for a finite change of the gauge condition.[2]

For completeness, note that finite field-dependent BRST transformations for general gauge theories in the BV quantization scheme [28] have been examined in [27], and earlier in [26]. A construction of finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations in the Sp(2)-covariant generalized Hamiltonian formalism [7, 8] has been recently developed [2] for arbitrary dynamical systems subject to first-class constraints, along with an explicit construction of the parameters λ_a inducing a change of the gauge for Yang–Mills theories in the class of R_ξ-like gauges. In the case of BRST–BFV symmetry [22], a study of finite field-dependent BRST–BFV transformations in the generalized Hamiltonian formalism [23, 24] has been presented in [25]. In all of these papers, the crucial point has been the so-called compensation equation, first suggested for finite BRST transformations in the Yang–Mills theory [29] within the Faddeev–Popov quantization rules [21], which establishes a one-to-one correspondence of field-dependent parameter(s) of BRST(-antiBRST) transformations with a finite change of the gauge condition.

In the discussion of [3], namely, see Eqs. (6.2), (6.3) therein, we have announced an explicit Jacobian in the partition function Z_F which corresponds to a change of variables with field-dependent (and functionally-dependent) parameters λ_a of finite BRST-antiBRST transformations, on the basis of which we solve the compensation equation in order to find $\lambda_a = \lambda_a(\Delta F)$. This provides the gauge independence of the vacuum functional, $Z_F = Z_{F+\Delta F}$, and allows one to obtain the Ward identities and study the problem of gauge dependence for the generating functional of Green's functions; see Eqs. (6.5)–(6.10) in [3]. This concept was used in [3] to relate (on the basis of field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations) quantum BRST-antiBRST invariant actions of the Freedman–Townsend model (of

[1] According to the authors of [14], however, Eqs. (2.3a), (2.3b) apply to the general case, so that the same parameter $\delta\Lambda$ has to be understood differently in each of these formulae.

[2] Calculations of Jacobians corresponding to BRST-antiBRST transformations linear in finite field-dependent parameters for Yang–Mills and more general gauge theories with an open gauge algebra, as well as transformations with polynomial, albeit functionally-independent, parameters λ_a, is an essential feature of our future research [20].

an antisymmetric non-Abelian tensor field with a reducible gauge symmetry) in two different gauges determined by a gauge Boson quadratic in the fields.

On the other hand, some problems examined in [1] for Yang–Mills theories have remained unsolved. In addition, the topical problem of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization on the basis of finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations, as well as the issue of BRST symmetry breaking in the BV quantization, initiated in [26, 30, 31] on the basis of finite BRST–BV transformations [27], have not been considered.

Based on by these reasons, we intend to address the following problems related to gauge theories in Lagrangian formalism:

1. calculation of the Jacobian for a change of variables in the partition function related to *finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations* being polynomial in powers of the Sp(2)-doublet of Grassmann-odd (and functionally-dependent) parameters $\lambda_a = s_a\Lambda$, induced by a finite Grassmann-even functional $\Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda)$ and by the Grassmann-odd generators s_a of BRST-antiBRST transformations;

2. derivation of the Ward identities and consideration of gauge dependence on the basis of the compensation equation for an unknown functional $\Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda)$ generating the Sp(2)-doublet λ_a, in order to establish a relation of the partition function Z_F (with the quantum action $\mathcal{S}_F$ in a certain gauge determined by a gauge Boson F) to another partition function $Z_{F+\Delta F}$ (with the quantum action $\mathcal{S}_{F+\Delta F}$ in a different gauge $F + \Delta F$);

3. application of these considerations to obtain a new form of the Ward identities and investigation of gauge dependence in gauge theories with a closed algebra of rank 1, including Yang–Mills theories;

4. introduction of the concept of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization, derivation of the Ward identities and the study of gauge dependence on the basis of finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations;

5. consideration of a new form (as compared to [30, 31]) of BRST symmetry breaking in the BV quantization, derivation of the Ward identities and the study of gauge dependence on the basis of finite field-dependent BRST-BV transformations;

6. application of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking concept to the average effective action in Yang–Mills theories within the functional renormalization group approach.

The work is organized as follows. In Section 2, we bring to mind the general setup of finite BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian transformations and prove our conjecture [3] as to the form of the Jacobian that corresponds to a change of variables with functionally-dependent parameters, $\lambda_a = s_a\Lambda$. In Section 3, we examine the compensation equation, derive a new form of the Ward identities depending on the functionals λ_a, and investigate the problem of gauge dependence, including the case of Yang–Mills theories. We also obtain the Ward identities using the field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations and study the gauge dependence of the generating functionals of Green's functions for general gauge theories in Section 3.1 and for Yang–Mills theories in Section 3.2. In Section 4, we introduce the notion of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization, derive the Ward identities and study gauge dependence on the basis of finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations. In Appendix A, we reconsider the concept of BRST symmetry breaking within the BV quantization scheme, first developed in [30, 31]. In Appendix B, we introduce, for the first time in the BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian quantization, an average effective action and examine it in a way consistent with the gauge independence of the conventional S-matrix in YangMills theories using different gauges. We employ the notation of our previous works [1, 3]. Unless otherwise specified by

an arrow, derivatives with respect to the fields are taken from the right, and those with respect to the corresponding antifields are taken from the left. The raising and lowering of Sp(2)-indices, $s^a = \varepsilon^{ab} s_b$, $s_a = \varepsilon_{ab} s^b$, is carried out with the help of a constant antisymmetric tensor ε^{ab}, $\varepsilon^{ac}\varepsilon_{cb} = \delta^a_b$, subject to the normalization condition $\varepsilon^{12} = 1$.

2 Finite Field-Dependent BRST-antiBRST Transformation and its Jacobian

In the Discussion of our recent work [1], namely, in Eqs. (6.4), (6.5), we have announced the form of finite BRST-antiBRST transformations $\Delta\Gamma^p$ for a general gauge theory in Lagrangian formalism and subsequently proved [3] for constant finite anticommuting parameters λ_a that it actually leaves the integrand $\mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma}$ in the partition function $Z_F = \int d\Gamma\, \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma}$ invariant to all orders in powers of λ_a. Namely, the finite BRST-antiBRST transformations[3]

$$\Delta_\lambda \Gamma^p = \Gamma^p \left(\overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a + \frac{1}{4} \overleftarrow{s}^2 \lambda^2 \right) \Longrightarrow \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma+\Delta_\lambda\Gamma} = \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma} \ ,$$
$$\text{where} \quad \overleftarrow{s}^a = \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\pi^{Aa} + \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}} S_{,A} \, (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} - \varepsilon^{ab} \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\bar{\phi}_A} \phi^*_{Ab} \, (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} + \varepsilon^{ab} \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\pi^{Ab}} \lambda^A \ , \quad \overleftarrow{s}^2 = \overleftarrow{s}^a \overleftarrow{s}_a \ , \tag{2.1}$$

are realized on the coordinates $\Gamma^p = (\phi^A, \phi^*_{Aa}, \bar{\phi}_A, \pi^{Aa}, \lambda^A)$ of the space of fields ϕ^A, antifields $(\phi^*_{Aa}, \bar{\phi}_A)$ and auxiliary variables (π^{Aa}, λ^A) used in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization [4, 5], with the following distribution of Grassmann parity and ghost number:

$$\begin{aligned} &\varepsilon\left(\Gamma^p\right) = \left(\varepsilon_A, \ \varepsilon_A + 1, \ \varepsilon_A, \ \varepsilon_A + 1, \ \varepsilon_A\right) \ , \\ &\mathrm{gh}\left(\Gamma^p\right) = \left(\mathrm{gh}(\phi^A), \ (-1)^a - \mathrm{gh}(\phi^A), \ -\mathrm{gh}(\phi^A), \ (-1)^{a+1} + \mathrm{gh}(\phi^A), \ \mathrm{gh}(\phi^A)\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

In terms of the components, the transformations (2.1) are given by ($S_{,A} \equiv \delta S/\delta\phi^A$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\lambda \phi^A &= \pi^{Aa}\lambda_a + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^A\lambda^2, & \Delta_\lambda \bar{\phi}_A \ &= \ \varepsilon^{ab}\lambda_a \phi^*_{Ab} + \frac{1}{2} S_{,A} \lambda^2 \ , \\ \Delta_\lambda \pi^{Aa} &= -\varepsilon^{ab}\lambda^A\lambda_b \ , & \Delta_\lambda \lambda^A \ &= \ 0 \ , \\ \Delta_\lambda \phi^*_{Aa} &= \lambda_a S_{,A} + \frac{1}{4}(-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\varepsilon_{ab} \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta\phi^A \delta\phi^B} \pi^{Bb} + \varepsilon_{ab} \frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi^B} \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta\phi^A \delta\phi^*_{Bb}} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} - \phi^*_{Ba} \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta\phi^A \delta\bar{\phi}_B} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \right) \lambda^2 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

The operators $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ in (2.1) are the generators of (infinitesimal $\lambda_a \equiv \mu_a$) BRST-antiBRST transformations [4] for the integrand, $\mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma+\delta\Gamma} = \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma}$,

$$\delta\Gamma^p = \Gamma^p \overleftarrow{s}^a \mu_a = \delta\left(\phi^A, \ \phi^*_{Ab}, \ \bar{\phi}_A, \ \pi^{Ab}, \ \lambda^A\right) = \left(\pi^{Aa}, \ \delta^a_b S_{,A} \, (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \, , \ \varepsilon^{ab}\phi^*_{Ab} \, (-1)^{\varepsilon_A + 1} \, , \ \varepsilon^{ab}\lambda^A, \ 0\right) \mu_a \ , \tag{2.4}$$

which may be regarded as integrability conditions for the validity of $\mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma+\Delta_\lambda\Gamma} = \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma}$ to all orders in the parameters λ_a, with the restriction $\overleftarrow{U}^a$ of the generators $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ to the subspace $(\phi^A, \pi^{Ab}, \lambda^A)$ being anticommuting and nilpotent:

$$\overleftarrow{U}^a = \overleftarrow{s}^a|_{\phi,\pi,\lambda} = \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\pi^{Aa} + \varepsilon^{ab}\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\pi^{Ab}}\lambda^A \ , \quad \overleftarrow{U}^a \overleftarrow{U}^b + \overleftarrow{U}^b \overleftarrow{U}^a = 0 \ , \quad \overleftarrow{U}^a \overleftarrow{U}^b \overleftarrow{U}^c = 0 \ . \tag{2.5}$$

[3] As shown in [1], the validity of the algebra of BRST-antiBRST transformations for its generators $\overleftarrow{s}^a \overleftarrow{s}^b + \overleftarrow{s}^b \overleftarrow{s}^a = 0$, realized in an appropriate space of variables in Lagrangian [4] and generalized Hamiltonian formalism [8] allows one to restore the finite group form $\Gamma' - \Gamma = \Gamma\left(\overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a + (1/4)\overleftarrow{s}^2 \lambda^2\right)$, or, identically, $\Gamma' = \Gamma\left(1 + \overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a + (1/4)\overleftarrow{s}^2 \lambda^2\right) = \Gamma \exp\left(\overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a\right)$. Equivalently, the realization of the generators in terms of odd anticommuting vector fields, $\overleftarrow{s}^a(\Gamma) = \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\Gamma^p}(\Gamma^p \overleftarrow{s}^a)$, due to the Frobenius theorem leads to the same form of finite BRST-antiBRST transformations. Notice that the finite BRST-antiBRST transformations are, in fact, constructed from infinitesimal gauge transformations (instead of finite gauge group transformations) of classical variables in the case of finite values of gauge parameters.

This makes it possible to present the generating functional $Z_F(J)$ of Green's functions in [3, 4], depending on external sources J_A, with $\varepsilon(J_A) = \varepsilon_A$, $\mathrm{gh}(J_A) = -\mathrm{gh}(\phi^A)$, as the path integral

$$Z_F(J) = \int d\Gamma \ \exp\left\{(i/\hbar)\left[\mathcal{S}_F\left(\Gamma\right) + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\} \ , \quad \mathcal{S}_F = \mathcal{S} - (1/2)\, F\overleftarrow{U}^2 \ , \quad \overleftarrow{U}^2 \equiv \overleftarrow{U}^a\overleftarrow{U}_a \ ,$$
$$\text{where} \quad \mathcal{S} = S + \phi^*_{Aa}\pi^{Aa} + \bar{\phi}_A\lambda^A \ , \quad S = S\left(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}\right) \ , \quad F = F\left(\phi\right) \ . \tag{2.6}$$

Here, $\hbar$ is the Planck constant; the configuration space ϕ^A, containing the classical fields A^i and the Sp(2)-symmetric ghost-antighost and Nakanishi–Lautrup fields, depends on the irreducible [4] or reducible [5] character of a given gauge theory, whereas the auxiliary fields (π^{Aa}, λ^A) are required in order to introduce the gauge by using a gauge-fixing Bosonic functional $F(\phi)$ with a vanishing ghost number. In its turn, the Bosonic functional $S(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi})$ with a vanishing ghost number is a solution of the generating equations

$$\frac{1}{2}(S, S)^a + V^a S = i\hbar\Delta^a S \Longleftrightarrow \left(\Delta^a + \frac{i}{\hbar}V^a\right)\exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}S\right) = 0 \ , \tag{2.7}$$

with a boundary condition for vanishing antifields ϕ^*_{Aa}, $\bar{\phi}_A$ given by the classical action $S_0(A)$. In (2.7), the extended antibracket $(G, H)^a$ for arbitrary functionals G, H and the operators Δ^a, V^a are given by

$$(G, H)^a = G\left(\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}}\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\right)H \ , \quad \Delta^a = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A}\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}} \ , \quad V^a = \varepsilon^{ab}\phi^*_{Ab}\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta\bar{\phi}_A} \ . \tag{2.8}$$

The invariance [3] of the integrand $\mathcal{I}^{(F)}_\Gamma = d\Gamma \exp\left[(i/\hbar)\,\mathcal{S}_F\left(\Gamma\right)\right]$ in (2.6) with vanishing sources $J_A = 0$ under the global finite BRST-antiBRST transformations (2.1) can be established by using the generating equations (2.7), while taking into account the nilpotency $\overleftarrow{U}^a\overleftarrow{U}^b\overleftarrow{U}^c = 0$ of the operators $\overleftarrow{U}^a$ in (2.6) and using the explicit change [3]

$$\Delta_\lambda G = G\left(\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\lambda^2\right) \tag{2.9}$$

under the transformations (2.1) of an arbitrary functional $G\left(\Gamma\right)$ expandable as a power series in Γ^p,

$$G\left(\Gamma + \Delta_\lambda\Gamma\right) = G\left(\Gamma\right) + G_{,p}\left(\Gamma\right)\Delta_\lambda\Gamma^p + (1/2)\, G_{,pq}\left(\Gamma\right)\Delta_\lambda\Gamma^q\Delta_\lambda\Gamma^p = G\left(\Gamma\right) + \Delta_\lambda G\left(\Gamma\right) \ , \quad \text{with} \quad G_{,p} \equiv G\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\Gamma^p} \ , \tag{2.10}$$

with allowance for the explicit form [3] of the Jacobian $\mathrm{Sdet}\left\|(\Gamma^p + \Delta_\lambda\Gamma^p)\,\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\Gamma^q}\right\| \equiv \exp\left(\Im\right)$

$$\exp\left(\Im\right) = \exp\left[-\left(\Delta^a S\right)\lambda_a - \frac{1}{4}\left(\Delta^a S\right)\overleftarrow{s}_a\lambda^2\right] \tag{2.11}$$

corresponding to the transformation of the integration measure $d\Gamma$ with respect to the change of variables $\Gamma \to \check{\Gamma} = \Gamma + \Delta_\lambda\Gamma$, namely,

$$d\check{\Gamma} = \mathrm{Sdet}\left\|(\Gamma^p + \Delta_\lambda\Gamma^p)\,\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\Gamma^q}\right\| = d\Gamma \ \exp\left[\mathrm{Str}\ln\left(\mathbb{I}+M\right)\right] \equiv d\Gamma \ \exp\left(\Im\right) \ ,$$
$$\text{where} \quad \Im = \mathrm{Str}\ln\left(\mathbb{I}+M\right) = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^n}{n}\mathrm{Str}\ M^n \ . \tag{2.12}$$

In [3], we have announced that the Jacobian $\exp\left(\Im\right)$ and the related integration measure $d\check{\Gamma}$ corresponding to a finite change of variables $\Gamma \to \check{\Gamma}$ with the choice of field-dependent parameters $\lambda_a = s_a\Lambda$ for $\Lambda = \Lambda\left(\phi, \pi, \lambda\right)$, inspired by the infinitesimal field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations of [1, 4], should take the form

$$\exp\left(\Im\right) = \exp\left[-\left(\Delta^a S\right)\lambda_a - \frac{1}{4}\left(\Delta^a S\right)\overleftarrow{s}_a\lambda^2\right]\exp\left[\ln\left(1+f\right)^{-2}\right] \ , \quad \text{with} \quad f = -\frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2, \tag{2.13}$$

$$d\check{\Gamma} = d\Gamma \ \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}\left(-i\hbar\Im\right)\right] = d\Gamma \ \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[i\hbar\left(\Delta^a S\right)\lambda_a + \frac{i\hbar}{4}\left(\Delta^a S\right)\overleftarrow{s}_a\lambda^2 + i\hbar\ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^2\right]\right\} \ , \tag{2.14}$$

where $\Lambda\left(\phi,\pi,\lambda\right)$ is a certain Bosonic potential with a vanishing ghost number. Therefore, in order to prove the above statement (2.13), (2.14), let us examine the general case of a finite BRST-antiBRST transformation (2.1) parameterized by $\lambda_a\left(\Gamma\right)$ and consider the even matrix M in (2.12) with the elements M^p_q, $\varepsilon\left(M^p_q\right)=\varepsilon_p+\varepsilon_q$,

$$M^p_q=\Delta\Gamma^p\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\Gamma^q}=U^p_q+V^p_q+W^p_q\,,\ \text{ with }\ V^p_q=\left(V_1\right)^p_q+\left(V_2\right)^p_q\ , \tag{2.15}$$

$$\text{for }\ U^p_q=X^{pa}\lambda_{a,q}\ ,\quad \left(V_1\right)^p_q=\lambda_aX^{pa}_{,q}\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p+1}\ ,\quad \left(V_2\right)^p_q=\lambda_aY^p\lambda^a_{,q}\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p+1}\ ,\quad W^p_q=-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2Y^p_{,q}\ , \tag{2.16}$$

taking account of the notation [3]

$$X^{pa}\equiv\Gamma^p\overleftarrow{s}^a\quad\text{and}\quad Y^p\equiv\left(1/2\right)X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}\varepsilon_{ba}=-\left(1/2\right)\Gamma^p\overleftarrow{s}^2\ . \tag{2.17}$$

First of all, let us establish a useful relation between the matrices V_1 and W in (2.15). To do so, we use the generating equations (2.7) and represent the condition of invariance of the integrand $\mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma}$ in (2.6) under the BRST-antiBRST transformations $\delta\Gamma^p=\Gamma^p\overleftarrow{s}^a\mu_a=X^{pa}\mu_a$ given by (2.4) in the form

$$\mathcal{S}_{F,p}X^{pa}=i\hbar X^{pa}_{,p}\ ,\quad\text{where}\quad X^{pa}_{,p}=-\Delta^aS\ . \tag{2.18}$$

Let us now write identically:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1\right)+\mathrm{Str}\left(W\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1^2\right)&=\left[\left(V_1\right)^p_p+W^p_p-\frac{1}{2}\left(V_1\right)^p_q\left(V_1\right)^q_p\right]\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p}\\&=X^{pa}_{,p}\lambda_a-\frac{1}{2}\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p}\left(Y^p_{,p}-\frac{1}{2}X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}_{,p}\varepsilon_{ba}\right)\lambda^2\ .\end{aligned}$$

Considering

$$\begin{aligned}Y^p_{,p}-\frac{1}{2}X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}_{,p}\varepsilon_{ba}&=\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ba}\left(X^{pa}_{,qp}X^{qb}\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p\left(\varepsilon_q+1\right)}+X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}_{,p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ba}X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}_{,p}\\&=\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ba}\left(X^{pa}_{,qp}X^{qb}\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p\left(\varepsilon_q+1\right)}+X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}_{,p}-X^{pa}_{,q}X^{qb}_{,p}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ba}X^{pa}_{,pq}X^{qb}\left(-1\right)^{\varepsilon_p}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

we arrive at

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1\right)+\mathrm{Str}\left(W\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1^2\right)=X^{pa}_{,p}\lambda_a+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ab}X^{pa}_{,pq}X^{qb}\lambda^2\ , \tag{2.20}$$

where (2.18) implies ($G\overleftarrow{s}^a\equiv s^aG$)

$$X^{pa}_{,p}=-\Delta^aS\ ,\quad X^{pa}_{,pq}X^{qb}=-\left(\Delta^aS\right)_{,p}X^{pb}=-s^b\left(\Delta^aS\right)\ ,\ \text{ with }\ G_{,p}X^{pa}=G_{,p}\left(s^a\Gamma^p\right)=s^aG\ . \tag{2.21}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1\right)+\mathrm{Str}\left(W\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1^2\right)=-\left(\Delta^aS\right)\lambda_a-\frac{1}{4}\left(s_a\Delta^aS\right)\lambda^2\ . \tag{2.22}$$

Taking account of the relation between the matrices V_1 and W in (2.15), established for arbitrary $\lambda_a(\Gamma)$, we now proceed to the case of field-dependent parameters $\lambda_a=\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a$ in (2.1), determined by a Bosonic potential $\Lambda\left(\phi,\pi,\lambda\right)$, which implies $\lambda_a=\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a$, in view of (2.5). To do so, using the property $\mathrm{Str}\left(AB\right)=\mathrm{Str}\left(BA\right)$ of arbitrary even matrices A, B and the fact that the occurrence of $W\sim\lambda^2$ in $\mathrm{Str}\left(M^n\right)$ more than once yields zero, $\lambda^4\equiv0$, we have

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(M^n\right)=\mathrm{Str}\left(U+V+W\right)^n=\sum_{k=0}^{1}C^k_n\mathrm{Str}\left[\left(U+V\right)^{n-k}W^k\right]\ ,\quad C^k_n=\frac{n!}{k!\left(n-k\right)!}\ . \tag{2.23}$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(U+V+W\right)^n=\mathrm{Str}\left(U+V\right)^n+n\mathrm{Str}\left[\left(U+V\right)^{n-1}W\right]=\mathrm{Str}\left(U+V\right)^n+n\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}W\right)\ , \tag{2.24}$$

since any occurrence of $W \sim \lambda^2$ and $V \sim \lambda_a$ simultaneously entering $\mathrm{Str}\,(M)^n$ yields zero, owing to $\lambda_a\lambda^2 = 0$, as a consequence of which W can only be coupled with U^{n-1}. Having established (2.24), let us examine $\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}W\right)$, namely,

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}W\right) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}\,(W)\ , & n = 1\ , \\ 0\ , & n > 1\ . \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

Indeed, due to the contraction property $U^2 = f \cdot U \Longrightarrow U^l = f^{l-1} \cdot U$, where f is a Bosonic parameter (for details, see (2.36) below), we have

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}W\right) = f^{n-2}\mathrm{Str}\,(UW)\ , \quad n > 1\ , \tag{2.26}$$

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(UW) = \mathrm{Str}\,(WU) = (WU)^p_p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = W^p_q U^q_p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\left(Y^p_{,q}X^{qa}\right)\lambda_{a,p}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = 0\ , \tag{2.27}$$

since, taking account of the restricted dependence of $\lambda_a(\phi,\pi,\lambda)$ on Γ^p, the nilpotency (2.5) of the operators $\overleftarrow{U}^a$, being the restriction of $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ to the subspace $(\phi^A, \pi^{Aa}, \lambda^A)$, and using the definitions (2.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(Y^p_{,q}X^{qa}\right)\lambda_{a,p}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} &= Y^p\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_{a,p}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma^p\overleftarrow{s}^2\overleftarrow{s}^a\right)\lambda_{a,p}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma^p\overleftarrow{U}^2\overleftarrow{U}^a\right)\lambda_{a,p}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(M^n) = \mathrm{Str}\,(U+V)^n + n\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}W\right) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}\,(U+V) + \mathrm{Str}\,(W)\ , & n = 1\ , \\ \mathrm{Str}\,(U+V)^n\ , & n > 1\ , \end{cases} \tag{2.28}$$

so that W drops out of $\mathrm{Str}\,(M^n)$, $n > 1$, and enters the Jacobian only as $\mathrm{Str}\,(W)$. Next, as we examine the contribution $\mathrm{Str}\,(U+V)^n$ in (2.28), we notice that an occurrence of $V \sim \lambda_a$ more then twice yields zero, $\lambda_a\lambda_b\lambda_c \equiv 0$. Direct calculations for $n = 2, 3$ lead to

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(U+V)^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} C^k_n\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-k}V^k\right) = \mathrm{Str}\left(U^n + nU^{n-1}V + C^2_nP^{n-2}V^2\right)\ . \tag{2.29}$$

Using considerations identical with those presented in Appendix B.2 of [1], we can prove by induction, taking account of the fact $V \sim \lambda_a$ and the contraction property $U^2 = f \cdot U$, established in (2.36), that for any $n \geq 4$ we have

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(U+V)^n = \mathrm{Str}\left(U^n + nU^{n-1}V + nU^{n-2}V^2 + K_nU^{n-3}VUV\right)\ , \tag{2.30}$$

where the coefficients K_n are given by

$$K_n = C^2_n - n\ , \quad C^2_n = n\,(n-1)\,/2 \implies K_n = n\,(n-3)\,/2\ , \tag{2.31}$$

which implies

$$\frac{C^2_n}{n} - \frac{K_n}{n} = 1\ , \quad \frac{C^2_n}{n} - \frac{K_{n+1}}{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}\ . \tag{2.32}$$

According to the previous considerations,

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(M^n) = \sum_{k=0}^{1} C^k_n\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-k}V^k\right) + D_n\ , \quad n \geq 1\ , \tag{2.33}$$

$$\text{for}\ \ D_n = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}\,(W)\ , & n = 1\ , \\ C^2_n\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right)\ , & n = 2, 3\ , \\ \left(C^2_n - K_n\right)\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right) + K_n\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-3}VUV\right)\ , & n > 3\ , \end{cases} \tag{2.34}$$

we have

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(M^n) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}\,(U) + \mathrm{Str}\,(V) + \mathrm{Str}\,(W)\ , & n = 1\ , \\ \mathrm{Str}\,(U^n) + C_n^1 \mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}V\right) + C_n^2 \mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right)\ , & n = 2, 3\ , \\ \mathrm{Str}\,(U^n) + C_n^1 \mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}V\right) + \left(C_n^2 - K_n\right) \mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right) + K_n \mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-3}VUV\right)\ , & n > 3\ . \end{cases} \tag{2.35}$$

First of all, the calculation of the Jacobian is based on the previously established relation (2.22) between the matrices V_1, W, and therefore we will take account of the related combination

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(V_1) + \mathrm{Str}\,(W) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1^2\right)\ .$$

Besides, recalling that $\lambda_a = \Lambda \overleftarrow{U}_a$, we can deduce the additional property

$$U^2 = f \cdot U\ , \quad f = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\,(U)\ , \tag{2.36}$$

where the quantity f is given by

$$\lambda_{b,p} X^{pa} = \lambda_b \overleftarrow{U}^a = \delta_b^a f \Longrightarrow f = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_a \overleftarrow{U}^a = -\frac{1}{2}\Lambda \overleftarrow{U}^2\ . \tag{2.37}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(U^2\right)_q^p = (U)_r^p\,(U)_q^r = X^{pa}\left(\lambda_{a,r} X^{rb}\right)\lambda_{b,q} = f \cdot \delta_a^b X^{pa}\lambda_{b,q} = f \cdot (U)_q^p\ , \\ &\lambda_{a,q} X^{qb} = \lambda_a \overleftarrow{s}^b = \lambda_a \overleftarrow{U}^b = \Lambda \overleftarrow{U}_a \overleftarrow{U}^b = \delta_a^b f\ , \quad f = -F_{,A}\lambda^A - (1/2)\,\varepsilon_{ab}\pi^{Aa}F_{,AB}\pi^{Bb}\ , \\ &f = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{a,p}X^{pa} = -\frac{1}{2}U_p^p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\,(U)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

As a consequence,

$$\mathrm{Str}\ \ (UV) = \mathrm{Str}\ \ (VU) = (1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)\ , \tag{2.39}$$

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(UV^2\right) = \mathrm{Str}\,(VUV) = (1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}\left[(V_1+V_2)\,V_2\right]\ , \tag{2.40}$$

$$\mathrm{Str}\,(UVUV) = \mathrm{Str}\,(VUVU) = (1+f)^2\,\mathrm{Str}\left(V_2^2\right)\ . \tag{2.41}$$

Indeed, due to the relations (2.17), (2.37) and their consequences ($G\overleftarrow{U}^a \equiv U^a G$)

$$U^a U^b \Gamma^{\underline{p}} = -\varepsilon^{ab} Y^{\underline{p}}\ , \quad U^a \lambda^b = -\varepsilon^{ab} f\ , \tag{2.42}$$

with account taken of the notation

$$\Gamma^{\underline{p}} = \left(\phi^A, \pi^{Aa}, \lambda^A\right)\ , \tag{2.43}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Str}\ VU &= (VU)_p^p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = V_r^p U_p^r\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = -\lambda_a\left(X_{,r}^{pa} + Y^p \lambda_{,r}^a\right) X^{rb}\lambda_{b,p} \\ &= -\lambda_a\left[\left(s^b s^a \Gamma^{\underline{p}}\right) + Y^{\underline{p}}\left(s^b\lambda^a\right)\right]\lambda_{b,\underline{p}} = -\lambda_a\left[\left(U^b U^a \Gamma^{\underline{p}}\right) + Y^{\underline{p}}\left(U^b\lambda^a\right)\right]\lambda_{b,\underline{p}} \\ &= -\lambda_a\left(\varepsilon^{ab}Y^p + \varepsilon^{ab}Y^p f\right)\lambda_{b,p} = -\,(1+f)\,\lambda_a Y^p f \lambda_{,p}^a = (1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}\ V_2\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

which proves (2.39). In a similar way, using (2.42), (2.43) and the property of nilpotency $\lambda_a\lambda_b\lambda_c = 0$, it is straightforward to verify the remaining properties (2.40), (2.41) of the matrices U, V. As a consequence of (2.36) and (2.39)–(2.41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Str}\,(U^n) = f^{n-1}\mathrm{Str}\,(U) = -2f^n\ , && n \geq 1\ , \\ &\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}V\right) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}\,(V) = \mathrm{Str}\,(V_1) + \mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)\ , & n = 1\ , \\ f^{n-2}\mathrm{Str}\,(UV) = f^{n-2}\,(1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}\ V_2\ , & n > 1\ , \end{cases} \\ &\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}\left(V^2\right) = \mathrm{Str}\left(V_1^2\right) + 2\mathrm{Str}\,(V_1V_2) + \mathrm{Str}\left(V_2^2\right)\ , & n = 2\ , \\ f^{n-3}\mathrm{Str}\left(UV^2\right) = f^{n-3}\,(1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}\left[(V_1+V_2)\,V_2\right]\ , & n > 2\ , \end{cases} \\ &\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-3}VUV\right) = f^{n-4}\mathrm{Str}\,(UVUV) = f^{n-4}\,(1+f)^2\,\mathrm{Str}\ V_2^2\ , && n > 3\ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

We further notice that $\mathrm{Str}\,(V_1V_2) \not\equiv 0$. Indeed, in view of the definitions (2.17) and the nilpotency property $U^aU^bU^c = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(V_1V_2)^p_p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} &= \lambda_a X^{pa}_{,q} Y^q (\lambda^2)_{,p} = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_a \left(X^{pa}_{,q} X^{qb}_{,r}\right) X^{rd}\varepsilon_{db}(\lambda^2)_{,p} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda_a \left[(X^{\underline{pa}}_{,q} X^{qb})_{,r} - (X^{\underline{pa}}_{,q})_{,r} X^{qb}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_r(\varepsilon_q+1)}\right] X^{rd}\varepsilon_{db}(\lambda^2)_{,\underline{p}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda_a \left[(U^dU^bU^a\Gamma^p) - X^{pa}_{,qr} X^{qb} X^{rd}\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_r(\varepsilon_q+1)}\right] \varepsilon_{db}(\lambda^2)_{,p} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{bd} X^{qb} X^{pa}_{,rq} X^{rd}\lambda_a (\lambda^2)_{,p}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

Besides,

$$\mathrm{Str}\left(V_2^2\right) = \mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2) \not\equiv 0\ . \tag{2.47}$$

Indeed,

$$(V_2)^p_p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = \lambda_a Y^p \lambda^a_{,p}\ , \tag{2.48}$$

$$(Q_2)^p_q\,(Q_2)^q_p\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_p} = \left(\lambda_a Y^p \lambda^a_{,p}\right)\left(\lambda_b Y^q \lambda^b_{,q}\right)\ . \tag{2.49}$$

Therefore, $\Im$ in the expression (2.12) for the Jacobian $\exp(\Im)$ has the general structure

$$\begin{aligned}&\Im = A\,(f, V_1, W) + B\,(f|V_2) + C\,(f|V_1V_2)\ , \\ &\text{for}\ \ B\,(f|V_2) = b_1\,(f)\,\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2) + b_2\,(f)\,\mathrm{Str}\left(V_2^2\right) = \left[b_1\,(f) + b_2\,(f)\,\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)\right]\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)\ , \\ &\text{and}\ \ C\,(f|V_1V_2) = c\,(f)\,\mathrm{Str}\,(V_1V_2)\ .\end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

Let us examine $A\,(f, V_1, W)$. Namely, in view of (2.22) and $\mathrm{Str}\,(U^n) = -2f^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}A\,(f, V_1, W) &= \mathrm{Str}\,(V_1) + \mathrm{Str}\,(W) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Str}\left(V_1^2\right) + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^n}{n} f^n \\ &= -\left(\Delta^a S\right)\lambda_a - \frac{1}{4}\left(\Delta^a S\right)\overleftarrow{s}_a \lambda^2 - 2\ln(1+f)\ .\end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

Let us examine the explicit structure of the series related to $b_1\,(f)$: the quantity $\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)$ derives from $\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-1}V\right)$ for $n \geq 1$ in (2.45), and is coupled with the combinatorial coefficient C^1_n. The part of $\Im$ containing $\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)$ is given by

$$b_1\,(f)\,\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2) = C^1_1\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2) - \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^n}{n} C^1_n f^{n-2}\,(1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}\,(V_2)\ , \tag{2.52}$$

whence

$$b_1\,(f) = 1 - (1+f)\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^n f^n\,. \tag{2.53}$$

Let us examine the explicit structure of the series related to $b_2\,(f)$: the quantity $\mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2)$ derives from $\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right)$ for $n \geq 2$ in (2.45), coupled with the combinatorial coefficients C^2_n for $n = 2, 3$ and $\left(C^2_n - K_n\right)$ for $n > 3$, and also derives from $\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-3}VUV\right)$ for $n > 3$ in (2.45), coupled with the combinatorial coefficients K_n. The part of $\Im$ containing $\mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2)$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}b_2\,(f)\,\mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2) = &-\frac{(-1)^2}{2} C^2_2 \mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2) - \frac{(-1)^3}{3} C^2_3\,(1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2) \\ &- \sum_{n=4}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^n}{n}\left(C^2_n - K_n\right) f^{n-3}\,(1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2) - \sum_{n=4}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^n}{n} K_n f^{n-4}\,(1+f)^2\,\mathrm{Str}^2\,(V_2)\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

whence

$$b_2(f) = -\frac{1}{2} + (1+f) - \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n} \left[\left(C_n^2 - K_n\right) f^{n-3} (1+f) + K_n f^{n-4} (1+f)^2 \right] \ . \tag{2.55}$$

Let us examine the explicit structure of the series related to $c(f)$: the quantity $\mathrm{Str}(V_1V_2)$ derives from $\mathrm{Str}\left(U^{n-2}V^2\right)$ for $n \geq 2$ in (2.45), and is coupled with the combinatorial coefficients C_n^2, for $n = 2, 3$, and $C_n^2 - K_n$, for $n > 3$. The part of $\Im$ containing $\mathrm{Str}(V_1V_2)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} c(f)\,\mathrm{Str}(V_1V_2) = &-\frac{(-1)^2}{2} C_2^2 \mathrm{Str}(2V_1V_2) - \frac{(-1)^3}{3} C_3^2 (1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}(V_1V_2) \\ &- \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n} \left(C_n^2 - K_n\right) f^{n-3} (1+f)\,\mathrm{Str}(V_1V_2) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

whence

$$c(f) = -1 + (1+f) - \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n} \left(C_n^2 - K_n\right) f^{n-3} (1+f) = f - (1+f) \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} (-1)^n \left(\frac{C_n^2}{n} - \frac{K_n}{n} \right) f^{n-3} \ . \tag{2.57}$$

By virtue of (2.32), one can show [1] that the series $b_1(f)$, $b_2(f)$, $c(f)$, given by (2.53), (2.55), (2.56), vanish identically:

$$b_1(f) = b_2(f) = c(f) \equiv 0 \, . \tag{2.58}$$

From the vanishing of all the coefficients $b_1(f)$, $b_2(f)$, $c(f)$, we conclude that

$$B(f|V_2) = b_1(f)\,\mathrm{Str}(V_2) + b_2(f)\,\mathrm{Str}\left(V_2^2\right) \equiv 0 \ \text{ and } \ C(f|V_1V_2) = c(f)\,\mathrm{Str}(V_1V_2) \equiv 0 \ , \tag{2.59}$$

and therefore the Jacobian $\exp(\Im)$ is finally given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\Im = A(f, V_1, W) + B(f|V_2) + C(f|V_1V_2) = A(f, V_1, W) = -(\Delta^a S)\,\lambda_a - \frac{1}{4} (\Delta^a S) \overleftarrow{s}_a \lambda^2 - 2\ln(1+f) \ , \\ &\text{for } \ f = -(1/2)\,\Lambda \overleftarrow{U}^2 = -(1/2)\,\Lambda \overleftarrow{s}^2 \ , \quad \Lambda = \Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda) \ . \end{aligned}$$

which is identical with (2.13) and therefore proves (2.14).

3 Ward Identities and Gauge Dependence Problem

In this section, we touch upon the consequences (Subsection 3.1) implied by a solution of the compensation equation [3] for an unknown functional $\Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda)$ which determines a field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation that amounts to a precise change of the gauge-fixing functional for an arbitrary gauge theory. The modified Ward identities and gauge dependence for Yang–Mills theories and, more generally, for gauge theories with a closed algebra of rank 1 are examined in Subsection 3.2.

3.1 General Gauge Theory

Let us bring to mind the results of [3], based on the representation (2.14) for the Jacobian established in Section 2 for the change of variables (2.1), given by a field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation, $\Gamma \to \check{\Gamma} = \Gamma + \Delta_\lambda \Gamma$. First of all, making in Z_F a change of variables $\Gamma \to \check{\Gamma}$, with $\lambda_a = s_a \Lambda$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda)$, while taking account of the Jacobian (2.14), the change of the action $\mathcal{S}_F$ according to (2.9), and also using the invariance condition (2.18), related

to the generating equations (2.7), and its consequence resulting from applying the operator $\overleftarrow{s}_a$, with allowance made for the BRST-antiBRST invariance of the term $F\overleftarrow{U}^2$, we arrive at

$$Z_F \overset{\Gamma\to\check{\Gamma}}{=} \int d\Gamma\ \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[\mathcal{S}_F + (\mathcal{S}_F\overleftarrow{s}^a + i\hbar\Delta^a S)\,\lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\left(\mathcal{S}_F\overleftarrow{s}^2 + i\hbar\Delta^a S\overleftarrow{s}_a\right)\lambda^2 + i\hbar\ln\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^2\right]\right\}$$
$$= \int d\Gamma\ \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[\mathcal{S}_{F+\Delta F} + i\hbar\ln\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}^2\right]\right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

The coincidence of the vacuum functionals Z_F and $Z_{F+\Delta F}$, evaluated for the respective Bosonic functionals F and $F+\Delta F$, takes place in case there holds a compensation equation[4] for an unknown Bosonic functional $\Lambda = \Lambda(\phi,\pi,\lambda)$:

$$i\hbar\ln\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right)^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}^2, \tag{3.2}$$

where account has been taken of the relation $\overleftarrow{s}^a = \overleftarrow{U}^a$, which takes place for the operators $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ restricted to the variables (ϕ,π^a,λ), or, equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2 = 1-\exp\left(\frac{i}{4\hbar}\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}^2\right). \tag{3.3}$$

The solution of this equation for an unknown functional $\Lambda(\phi,\pi,\lambda)$, which determines $\lambda_a(\phi,\pi,\lambda)$ according to $\lambda_a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a$, with accuracy up to BRST-antiBRST exact terms (s^a being restricted to ϕ, π^a, λ), is given by

$$\Lambda(\Gamma|\Delta F) = \frac{i}{2\hbar}g(y)\Delta F\ ,\quad \text{for}\quad g(y) = [1-\exp(y)]/y\quad\text{and}\quad y\equiv\frac{i}{4\hbar}\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}^2\ , \tag{3.4}$$

and therefore the corresponding field-dependent parameters have the form

$$\lambda_a(\Gamma|\Delta F) = \frac{i}{2\hbar}g(y)\left(\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}_a\right), \tag{3.5}$$

whose approximation linear in ΔF is given by

$$\lambda_a(\Gamma|\Delta F) = \frac{i}{2\hbar}\left(\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}_a\right) + o(\Delta F). \tag{3.6}$$

Consequently, for any change ΔF of the gauge condition $F\to F+\Delta F$, we can construct a unique field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation with functionally-dependent parameters (3.5) that allows one to preserve the form of the partition function (3.1) for the same gauge theory. On the other hand, if we consider the compensation equation (3.2) for an unknown gauge variation ΔF with a given $\Lambda(\phi,\pi,\lambda)$, we can present it in the form

$$4i\hbar\ln\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right) = -\Delta F\overleftarrow{U}^2 \iff 4i\hbar\left[\sum_{n=1}\frac{(-1)^n}{2^n n}\left(\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right)^{n-1}\Lambda\right]\overleftarrow{U}^2 = \Delta F\overleftarrow{U}^2, \tag{3.7}$$

whose solution, with accuracy up to $\overleftarrow{U}^a$-exact terms, is given by

$$\Delta F(\Gamma|\Lambda) = 4i\hbar\left[\sum_{n=1}\frac{(-1)^n}{2^n n}\left(\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right)^{n-1}\Lambda\right] = 4i\hbar\left[\sum_{n=1}\frac{(-1)^n}{2^n n}\left(\lambda^a\overleftarrow{U}_a\right)^{n-1}\Lambda\right]. \tag{3.8}$$

Consequently, for any change of variables in the partition function Z_F given by finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations with the parameters $\lambda^a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^a$, we obtain the same partition function $Z_{F+\Delta F}$, however, evaluated in a gauge determined by the Bosonic functional $F+\Delta F$, in accordance with (3.8).

[4] In [3], we make a transformation parameterized by Λ to perform a transition from $Z_{F+\Delta F}$ to Z_F, which accounts for the opposite sign at ΔF in (3.2) and related formulae.

Making in (2.6) a field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation (2.1) and using the relations (2.14) and (3.4), we obtain a *modified Ward (Slavnov–Taylor) identity:*

$$\left\langle \left\{ 1 + \frac{i}{\hbar} J_A \phi^A \left[\overleftarrow{U}^a \lambda_a(\Lambda) + \frac{1}{4} \overleftarrow{U}^2 \lambda^2(\Lambda) \right] - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \right)^2 J_A \phi^A \overleftarrow{U}^a J_B(\phi^B) \overleftarrow{U}_a \lambda^2(\Lambda) \right\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda \overleftarrow{U}^2 \right)^{-2} \right\rangle_{F,J} = 1 \ . \quad (3.9)$$

Here, the symbol "$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{F,J}$" for a quantity $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\Gamma)$ stands for a source-dependent average expectation value corresponding to a gauge-fixing $F(\phi)$:

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{F,J} = Z_F^{-1}(J) \int d\Gamma \ \mathcal{O}(\Gamma) \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[\mathcal{S}_F(\Gamma) + J_A \phi^A \right] \right\} \ , \quad \text{with} \quad \langle 1 \rangle_{F,J} = 1 \ . \quad (3.10)$$

Owing to the presence of $\Lambda(\Gamma)$, which implies $\lambda_a(\Lambda)$, the modified Ward identity depends on a choice of the gauge Boson $F(\phi)$ for non-vanishing J_A, according to (3.4), (3.5), and therefore the corresponding Ward identities for Green's functions, obtained by differentiating (3.9) with respect to the sources, contain the functionals $\lambda_a(\Lambda)$ and their derivatives as weight functionals. By virtue of (3.9) for constant λ_a, the usual Ward identities follow from the first order in λ_a, and a new Ward identity [3] from the second order in λ_a:

$$J_A \left\langle \phi^A \overleftarrow{U}^a \right\rangle_{F,J} = 0, \quad \left\langle J_A \phi^A \left[\overleftarrow{U}^2 - \overleftarrow{s}^a (i/\hbar) J_B \left(\phi^B \overleftarrow{U}_a \right) \right] \right\rangle_{F,J} = 0 \ . \quad (3.11)$$

In conclusion, taking account of (3.5), we find that (3.9) implies a relation which describes the gauge dependence of $Z_F(J)$ for a finite change of the gauge, $F \to F + \Delta F$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{F+\Delta F}(J) = Z_F(J) \Bigg\{ 1 + \Bigg\langle \frac{i}{\hbar} J_A \phi^A \left[\overleftarrow{U}^a \lambda_a(\Gamma| - \Delta F) + \frac{1}{4} \overleftarrow{U}^2 \lambda^2(\Gamma| - \Delta F) \right] \\ - \ (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \left(\frac{i}{2\hbar} \right)^2 J_B J_A \left(\phi^A \overleftarrow{U}^a \right) \left(\phi^B \overleftarrow{U}_a \right) \lambda^2(\Gamma| - \Delta F) \Bigg\rangle_{F,J} \Bigg\} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

3.2 Yang–Mills Theory

Let us apply the modified Ward identities (3.9) and the representation (3.12) for gauge dependence to the generating functional $Z_F(J)$ of irreducible gauge theories of rank 1 with a closed gauge algebra of the generators of gauge transformations, $R^i_\alpha(A)$, $\varepsilon(R^i_\alpha) = \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_\alpha$, including the case of Yang–Mills theories. The corresponding configuration space $\phi^A = \left(A^i, B^\alpha, C^{\alpha a} \right)$ contains the classical fields, the Nakanishi–Lautrup fields, and the ghost-antighost fields [4]. First of all, in accordance with [1], the generating functional of Green's functions $Z_F(J)$ and the corresponding quantum action $S_F(\phi)$ are readily obtained from (2.6), with S being a solution of (2.7), by integrating over $(\phi^*_a, \bar{\phi}, \pi^a, \lambda)$:

$$Z_F(J) = \int d\phi \ \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[S_F(\phi) + J_A \phi^A \right] \right\}, \quad (3.13)$$

$$S_F(\phi) = S_0(A) - (1/2) F \overleftarrow{s}^2 = S_0(A) + F_{,A} Y^A - (1/2) \varepsilon_{ab} X^{Aa} F_{,AB} X^{Bb} \ , \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$X^{Aa} = \left(X_1^{ia}, X_2^{\alpha a}, X_3^{\alpha ab} \right) \ , \qquad Y^A = \left(Y_1^i, Y_2^\alpha, Y_3^{\alpha a} \right) \ , \quad (3.15)$$

$$X_1^{ia} = R^i_\alpha C^{\alpha a} \ , \qquad X_2^{\alpha a} = -\frac{1}{2} F^\alpha_{\gamma\beta} B^\beta C^{\gamma a} - \frac{1}{12} (-1)^{\varepsilon_\beta} \left(2 F^\alpha_{\gamma\beta,j} R^j_\rho + F^\alpha_{\gamma\sigma} F^\sigma_{\beta\rho} \right) C^{\rho b} C^{\beta a} C^{\gamma c} \varepsilon_{cb} \ ,$$

$$X_3^{\alpha ab} = -\varepsilon^{ab} B^\alpha - \frac{1}{2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_\beta} F^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} C^{\gamma b} C^{\beta a} \ , \quad Y_1^i = R^i_\alpha B^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_\alpha} R^i_{\alpha,j} R^j_\beta C^{\beta b} C^{\alpha a} \varepsilon_{ab} \ ,$$

$$Y_2^\alpha = 0 \ , \qquad Y_3^{\alpha a} = -2 X_3^{\alpha a} \ , \quad (3.16)$$

and there hold the subsidiary conditions $X^{Aa}_{,A} = 0$. The nilpotent, $\overleftarrow{s}^a\overleftarrow{s}^b\overleftarrow{s}^c \equiv 0$, generators of BRST-antiBRST transformations $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ determine the finite BRST-antiBRST transformations:

$$\Delta_\lambda \phi^A = X^{Aa}\lambda_a - \frac{1}{2}Y^A\lambda^2 = \phi^A\left(\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\lambda^2\right) \ , \tag{3.17}$$

so that the corresponding Jacobian $\mathrm{Sdet}\left\|\left(\phi^A + \Delta_\lambda\phi^A\right)\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^B}\right\|$ of a change of variables $\phi \to \phi\left(1 + \overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\lambda^2\right)$ takes the form ($X^{Aa}_{,A} = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Sdet}\left\|\left(\phi^A + \Delta_\lambda\phi^A\right)\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^B}\right\| &= \exp\left[X^{Aa}_{,A}\lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ab}X^{Aa}_{,AB}X^{Bb}\lambda^2 + \ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^{-2}\right] \\ &= \exp\left[\ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^{-2}\right] \ , \text{ for } \lambda_a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a \, , \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

$$\mathrm{Sdet}\left\|\left(\phi^A + \Delta_\lambda\phi^A\right)\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^B}\right\| = \exp\left(X^{Aa}_{,A}\lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ab}X^{Aa}_{,AB}X^{Bb}\lambda^2\right) = 1 \ , \text{ for } \lambda_a = \mathrm{const} \ . \tag{3.19}$$

The conditions $X^{Aa}_{,A} = 0$ imply the relations $R^i_{\alpha,i}(A) = F^\alpha_{\alpha\beta}(A) = 0$ for the gauge generators and structure functions in $R^i_{\alpha,j}(A)R^j_\beta(A) - (-1)^{\varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_\beta}R^i_{\beta,j}(A)R^j_\alpha(A) = -R^i_\gamma(A)F^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}(A)$. The first Jacobian (3.18), corresponding to field-dependent (and functionally-dependent) parameters $\lambda_a(\phi) = (\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a)(\phi)$, is identical with that of [1].

As we apply the procedure used to obtain (3.9) to gauge theories with a closed algebra of rank 1, we arrive at a *modified Ward identity*:

$$\left\langle\left\{1 + \frac{i}{\hbar}J_A\left[X^{Aa}\lambda_a(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{2}Y^A\lambda^2(\Lambda)\right] - \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}\right)^2\varepsilon_{ab}J_AX^{Aa}J_BX^{Bb}\lambda^2(\Lambda)\right\}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^{-2}\right\rangle_{F,J} = 1 \ , \tag{3.20}$$

where the symbol "$\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle_{F,J}$" for a quantity $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ is determined as in (3.10), however, for $Z_F(J)$ in (3.13). The identity (3.20) has the same interpretation as (3.9): for constant λ_a we obtain from (3.20) an Sp(2)-doublet of the usual Ward identities at the first order in λ_a, and a derivative identity at the second order in λ_a:

$$J_A\left\langle X^{Aa}\right\rangle_{F,J} = 0, \quad \left\langle J_A\left[2Y^A + (i/\hbar)\,\varepsilon_{ab}X^{Aa}J_BX^{Bb}\right]\right\rangle_{F,J} = 0 \ . \tag{3.21}$$

By virtue of the representation (3.5) for $\lambda_a(\phi|\Delta F)$, applied to gauge theories in question, the Ward identity (3.20) implies a relation which describes the gauge dependence of $Z_F(J)$ for a finite change of the gauge $F \to F + \Delta F$:

$$\begin{aligned}Z_{F+\Delta F}(J) - Z_F(J) = Z_F(J)\Bigg\langle\frac{i}{\hbar}J_A\left[X^{Aa}\lambda_a\left(\phi|-\Delta F\right) - \frac{1}{2}Y^A\lambda^2\left(\phi|-\Delta F\right)\right] \\ - (-1)^{\varepsilon_B}\left(\frac{i}{2\hbar}\right)^2 J_BJ_A\left(X^{Aa}X^{Bb}\right)\varepsilon_{ab}\lambda^2\left(\phi|-\Delta F\right)\Bigg\rangle_{F,J} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

For Yang–Mills theories, in which $X^{Aa}_{,A} \equiv 0$, we obtain a new representation for the *modified Ward identity* (3.20), with the following identification of X^{Aa} and Y^A in (3.16), according to [1, 42]:

$$\begin{aligned} X^{\mu ma}_1 &= D^{\mu mn}C^{na} \ , & Y^{\mu m}_1 &= D^{\mu mn}B^n + \frac{1}{2}f^{mnl}C^{la}D^{\mu nk}C^{kb}\varepsilon_{ba} \ , \\ X^{ma}_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}f^{mnl}B^lC^{na} - \frac{1}{12}f^{mnl}f^{lrs}C^{sb}C^{ra}C^{nc}\varepsilon_{cb} \ , & Y^m_2 &= 0 \ , \\ X^{mab}_3 &= -\varepsilon^{ab}B^m - \frac{1}{2}f^{mnl}C^{lb}C^{na} \ , & Y^{ma}_3 &= f^{mnl}B^lC^{na} + \frac{1}{6}f^{mnl}f^{lrs}C^{sb}C^{ra}C^{nc}\varepsilon_{cb} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where $\phi^A = (A^{m\mu}, B^m, C^{ma})$; the generators $R^{mn}_\mu(x;y)$ of gauge transformations, the covariant derivatives D^{mn}_μ and the structure functions $F^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ are given by [1, 42]

$$R^{mn}_\mu(x;y) = D^{mn}_\mu(x)\delta(x-y) \, , \quad D^{mn}_\mu = \delta^{mn}\partial_\mu + f^{mln}A^l_\mu \, , \quad F^\gamma_{\alpha\beta} = f^{lmn}\delta(x-z)\delta(y-z) \, . \tag{3.24}$$

4 BRST-antiBRST Symmetry Breaking in Gauge Theories

In this section, we introduce the concept of *BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking* in gauge theories, inspired by our research [30] within the BV quantization scheme and partially repeating the study of [26] in which the problem of inconsistency of BRST symmetry breaking introduction claimed in [30] was resolved. To this end, let us consider a Bosonic functional $M = M(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi})$ having a vanishing ghost number and not necessarily being BRST-antiBRST invariant. This functional may be added to the action $\mathcal{S}_F$ in (3.14), or introduced in a multiplicative way into the partition function, $m = \exp(M)$, in order to improve the properties of the path integral, as has been done within the functional renormalization group approach [26, 33, 34, 35, 36], by means of the average affective action for the purpose of extraction of residual Gribov copies [10, 11]; see also [38, 39, 40]. Let us impose the condition that the corresponding path integral be well-defined and determine the generating functional of Green's functions $Z_{M,F}(J)$ with *broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry* as follows:

$$Z_{M,F}(J) = \int d\Gamma \, \exp\left\{(i/\hbar)\left[\mathcal{S}_F(\Gamma) + M(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}) + J_A \phi^A\right]\right\} \ , \quad \text{with} \quad Z_{0,F}(J) \equiv Z_F(J). \tag{4.1}$$

Here, we have not imposed[5] on M any equation ($\frac{1}{2}(M,M)^a - V^a M = 0$ or $\frac{1}{2}(M,M)^a - V^a M = -i\hbar\Delta^a M$) analogous to the so-called *soft BRST symmetry equation* [30, 31] for gauge theories in the BV formalism. Another requirement for M is the following inequality, in terms of the operators $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ in (2.1), with account taken of the representation (2.9) for a finite BRST-antiBRST variation of an arbitrary functional:

$$M\overleftarrow{s}^a \neq 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \Delta_\lambda M = M\left(\overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2 \lambda^2\right) \neq 0\,. \tag{4.2}$$

We shall refer to a gauge theory as having a broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization [4, 5] if the total action of the theory, $\mathcal{S}_{\rm tot} = \mathcal{S}_F + M$, determines the partition function $Z_{M,F}(0)$ in (4.1) and the broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry condition (4.2) for M is fulfilled.

It is well known that the introduction of a BRST-antiBRST non-invariant term to the quantum action may lead to the appearance of two fundamental problems for physical quantities (such as the S-matrix) in a theory with broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry, namely, gauge dependence and unitarity failure. For this reason, let us study the suggested construction of a gauge theory with broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry as concerns the dependence of the functional $Z_{M,F}(J)$ on a choice of the gauge condition.

Let us first obtain the Ward identities for a gauge theory with broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry. To this end, we make in (4.1) a field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation (2.1) and use the relations (3.4) and (2.14) to obtain a *modified Ward* (*Slavnov–Taylor* for $Z_{M,F}(J)$) *identity:*

$$\left\langle \left\{1 + \frac{i}{\hbar}\left[J_A\phi^A + M_F\right]\left[\overleftarrow{U}^a\lambda_a(\Lambda) + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{U}^2\lambda^2(\Lambda)\right] - \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}\right)^2\left[J_A\phi^A + M_F\right]\overleftarrow{U}^a\left[J_B\phi^B + M_F\right]\overleftarrow{U}_a\lambda^2(\Lambda)\right\} \right.$$
$$\left. \times \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right)^{-2}\right\rangle_{M,F,J} = 1\ , \tag{4.3}$$

where account has been taken of the fact that if in some reference frame with a gauge Boson $F(\phi)$ the broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry term has the form $M_F = M$ then in a different reference frame determined by a gauge Boson $(F + \Delta F)(\phi)$ it should be calculated as

$$M_{F+\Delta F} = M_F + \Delta_{\lambda(\Delta F)} M_F\,. \tag{4.4}$$

[5] On a basis of this equation, one can develop a concept of soft BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking in gauge theories, which may lead to additional Ward identities in terms of the functional M; however, we leave this problem outside the scope of the present work.

Here, the symbol "$\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle_{M,F,J}$" for a quantity $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\Gamma)$ stands for a source-dependent average expectation value corresponding to a gauge-fixing $F(\phi)$ with respect to $Z_{M,F}(J)$:

$$\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle_{M,F,J} = Z^{-1}_{M,F}(J)\int d\Gamma\ \mathcal{O}\left(\Gamma\right)\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[\mathcal{S}_F\left(\Gamma\right) + M_F + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\}\ ,\quad \text{with}\quad \langle 1\rangle_{M,F,J} = 1\ . \tag{4.5}$$

Owing to the presence of $\lambda_a(\Lambda)$, and therefore also of $\Lambda(\Gamma)$, the modified Ward identity depends on a choice of the gauge Boson $F(\phi)$ for non-vanishing J_A. For constant λ_a, the identity (4.3) decomposes in powers of λ_a and assumes the form of two independent and one dependent (at λ^2) identities:

$$\left\langle\left[J_A\phi^A + M_F\right]\overleftarrow{U}^a\right\rangle_{M,F,J} = 0\ , \tag{4.6}$$

$$\left\langle\left[J_A\phi^A + M_F\right]\overleftarrow{U}^2 - \left(\frac{i}{\hbar}\right)\left[J_A\phi^A + M_F\right]\overleftarrow{U}^a\left[J_B\phi^B + M_F\right]\overleftarrow{U}_a\right\rangle_{M,F,J} = 0\,. \tag{4.7}$$

The identities (4.3), (4.6), (4.7) are different from the Ward identities for a gauge theory without BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking terms.

With account taken of (3.5) and (4.4), the equality (4.3) implies a relation which describes the gauge dependence of $Z_{M,F}(J)$ for a finite change of the gauge $F \to F + \Delta F$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{M_{F+\Delta F},F+\Delta F}(J) - Z_{M,F}(J) = Z_{M,F}(J)\Big\langle\frac{i}{\hbar}J_A\phi^A\left[\overleftarrow{U}^a\lambda_a\left(\Gamma|-\Delta F\right) + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{U}^2\lambda^2\left(\Gamma|-\Delta F\right)\right] \\ -\ (-1)^{\varepsilon_B}\left(\frac{i}{2\hbar}\right)^2 J_BJ_A\left(\phi^A\overleftarrow{U}^a\right)\left(\phi^B\overleftarrow{U}_a\right)\lambda^2\left(\Gamma|-\Delta F\right)\Big\rangle_{M,F,J}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

From (3.12) it follows that upon the shell determined by $J_A = 0$ a finite change of the generating functional of Green's functions with a term of broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry does not depend on the choice of the gauge condition with respect to a finite change of the gauge, $F \to F + \Delta F$. The same statement takes place for the physical S-matrix, due to the equivalence theorem [41].

Notice that the gauge independence of the functional $Z_{M,F}(J)$ can be achieved by considering the broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry term M as a composite field, $M \to L\cdot M$, with an additional external bosonic source L to M, however, achieved in a way which takes into account the fact that M is not the same in different gauges, F and $F + \Delta F$, which means that $M_{F+\Delta F} = M_F + \Delta M_F(\Delta F)$. The constancy of M, $M_{F+\Delta F} = M_F$, at least for infinitesimal ΔF has been used in [32] in a BRST-antiBRST formalism for $M \equiv L_m\sigma^m(\phi)$ (with sources L_m and composite fields σ^m), which leads to the gauge independence of the corresponding generating functional of Green's functions with composite fields, $Z(J,\phi^*,\bar\phi,L)$ in [32], such that $Z_{M,F}(J) = Z_{\sigma,F}(J,L) = Z(J,\phi^*,\bar\phi,L)|_{\phi^*=\bar\phi=0}$ only on the mass shell determined in a larger space of sources (see (39), (40) therein) $J_A = L_m = 0$, with the subsidiary conditions $L_m = 0$, as compared to (4.8). At the same time, if one takes into account the non-constant character of the broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry term M in different gauges then, as has been demonstrated [38] in Lagrangian BRST quantization, the gauge independence of the generating functional of Green's functions with composite fields (where the Gribov–Zwanziger horizon functional H is considered as a composite field, $H = \sigma$, see Eqs. (18), (23) in [38]) is realized on the mass shell $J = 0$ determined only by the usual sources J for arbitrary L.

5 Conclusion

In the present work, we have proved the correctness (announced in [3]) of the Jacobian (2.14) for a change of variables in the partition function related to finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations[6] (2.1) being polynomial

[6] As follows from (B.4), (B.5), finite BRST-antiBRST transformations with constant parameters form a two-parametric Lie supergroup.

in powers of an Sp(2)-doublet of Grassmann-odd functionally-dependent parameters $\lambda_a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a$, generated by a finite even-valued functional $\Lambda(\phi, \pi, \lambda)$ and nilpotent Grassmann-odd operators $\overleftarrow{U}_a$ in (2.5), being the restriction of the generators s_a of BRST-antiBRST transformations to the subspace $(\phi^A, \pi^{Ab}, \lambda^A)$. Based on the representation (2.14), we justify the compensation equation for the parameters λ_a and find its solution (3.4), (3.5), which implies that for any finite change of the gauge condition $F \to F + \Delta F$ there exists a unique Sp(2)-doublet $\lambda_a(\Delta F)$ that ensures the gauge independence of the vacuum functionals, $Z_F = Z_{F+\Delta F}$. Conversely, any change of variables in the vacuum functional Z_F given by a finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation with functionally-dependent parameters $\lambda_a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a$ is related to a finite change of the gauge condition, $F \to F + \Delta F$, with $\Delta F(\Gamma|\Lambda)$ given by the solution (3.8) of the inverse problem for the compensation equation (3.7), so that the vacuum functional Z_F is gauge-independent. This follows from the fact that the Jacobian of such a change of variables and the change of the gauge are BRST-antiBRST-exact quantities. In the case of functionally-independent odd-valued parameters λ_a, finite BRST-antiBRST transformations generate in the corresponding Jacobian some BRST-antiBRST-non-exact terms, which may not correspond to a change of gauge-fixing in the quantum action. This problem is studied in our forthcoming work [20]. Note that finite field-dependent BRST transformations do not imply such a possibility. On the basis of the established representation for the Jacobian (2.14), we justify the modified Ward identity depending on the functionals $\lambda_a(\Delta F)$ in (3.9) and examine the problem of gauge-dependence for the generating functional of Green's functions $Z_F(J)$ in (3.12). As usual, albeit in the case of a finite change of the gauge Boson $\Delta F(\Gamma|\Lambda)$, the functional $Z_F(J)$ does not depend on a choice of the gauge on its the extremals given by $J_A = 0$, which is a basis for the study of gauge-dependence for the effective action.

We have examined in more detail the properties of gauge theories with a closed algebra of rank 1, including the Yang–Mills type of theories, on a basis of the above results for a general gauge theory, and obtained a modified Ward identity depending on the functional $\lambda_a(\Delta F)$ being restricted to the field variables $\left(A^i, B^\alpha, C^{\alpha a}\right)$ and $(A^{m\mu}, B^m, C^{ma})$ in (3.20). In addition, we have described (3.22) gauge-dependence in these theories.

We have introduced the concept of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization and obtained the modified Ward identity (4.3) for the generating functional $Z_{M,F}(J)$ of Green's functions with broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry. We have also studied gauge dependence on the basis of finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations. We have demonstrated that a non-renormalized functional $Z_{M,F}(J)$ does not depend on a choice of the gauge on the extremals given by $J_A = 0$ in (4.8), thus providing (leaving aside the unitarity problem) a consistent approach to introducing into a gauge theory of terms with broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry, which has been applied in [1] to determine, in a consistent pertubative way, the Gribov–Zwanziger horizon functional, obtained non-pertubatively in [11], by using any other gauge beyond the Landau gauge, which may be compared with other non-pertubative approaches [39, 40] to the Gribov–Zwanziger horizon functional in various gauges.

We have revised, as compared to the study of [26, 30, 31], the problem of BRST symmetry breaking in the BV quantization and obtained the modified Ward identity (A.12) for the generating functional of Green's functions with broken BRST symmetry $Z_{M,\psi}(J)$ without introducing a soft BRST symmetry condition for the BRST non-invariant term M. We have also investigated gauge dependence by using the recently proposed finite field-dependent BRST–BV transformations [27]. We have established that the non-renormalized functional $Z_{M,\psi}(J)$ does not depend on a choice of the gauge determined by a Fermionic functional $\psi(\phi)$ on the extremals given by $J_A = 0$ in (A.14), thus justifying, in addition to [26], the consistency of introduction into a gauge theory of terms with broken BRST symmetry in the framework of the BV quantization.

We have also introduced the concept of effective average action within functional renormalization group approach in Yang–Mills theories as an application of the general construction of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization by specifying the broken BRST-antiBRST symmetry term. To this end, we

have introduced a regulator action (B.7) and determined the generating functionals of Green's functions, including the effective average action. For these functionals, we have obtained the usual and modified (depending on the field-dependent odd-valued parameters λ_a) Ward identities with BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking terms. We have established that the non-renormalized functionals $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$, $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$ do not depend on a choice of the gauge determined by the functional $F(\phi)$ on the extremals given by $J_A = 0$ and on the hypersurface $\phi^*_{Aa} = 0$ in (B.29), thus providing a gauge-independent S-matrix for any value of the external momentum-shell parameter, k. We have proposed the form of the regulator action in any gauge (B.33)–(B.37) from the F_ξ-family (B.31) of gauges corresponding to the standard R_ξ-gauges.

Notice that similar problems have been discussed independently in [43]. As compared to our present work, the study of [43] deals with a calculation of the Jacobian for a change of variables given by BRST-antiBRST (BRST–BV by the terminology of [43]) transformations with functionally-independent field-dependent odd-valued parameters $\lambda_a(\Gamma)$, subsequently used to formulate a compensation equation, similar to (3.2), but having a 2×2 matrix form, which satisfies the condition of resolvability only for functionally-dependent parameters, $\lambda_a = \Lambda(\Gamma|\Delta F)\overleftarrow{U}_a$, whose form was first announced in our work [1].

In conclusion, note that among the interesting problems left outside the scope of the present work, besides the evaluation of Jacobians for arbitrary finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations, one may turn to the study of the group properties of finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations.

Acknowledgments

A.A.R. is grateful to D. Bykov, D. Francia and to all the participants of the International Seminar "QUARKS 2014" for useful discussions. He also thanks the Organizing Committee for the kind hospitality that made it possible to prepare the initial part of this work. The study was supported by the RFBR grant under Project No. 12-02-00121 and by the grant of Leading Scientific Schools of the Russian Federation under Project No. 88.2014.2. The work was also partially supported by the Ministry of Science of the Russian Federation, Grant No. 2014/223.

Appendix

A On BRST Symmetry Breaking in Gauge Theories

In this Appendix, we touch upon the study of *BRST symmetry breaking* in gauge theories, which is inspired by our works [26, 30] within the BV quantization scheme [28], and is based on the recently proposed BRST–BV field-dependent transformations [27]. To this end, let us remind that the generating functional of Green's functions $Z_\psi(J)$, implying the partition function $Z_\psi = Z_\psi(0)$, is given by [28]

$$Z_\psi(J) = \int d\phi\, d\phi^* d\lambda\, \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[S\,(\phi,\phi^*) + \left(\phi^*_A - \psi(\phi)\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\right)\lambda^A + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\}, \tag{A.1}$$

which, in terms of a nilpotent operator $\overleftarrow{U}$ introduced in [44], can be presented in the form

$$Z_\psi(J) = \int d\phi\, d\phi^* d\lambda\, \exp\left\{(i/\hbar)\left[S\,(\phi,\phi^*) + \left(\phi^*_A\phi^A - \psi(\phi)\right)\overleftarrow{U} + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\} \quad \text{for} \quad \overleftarrow{U} = \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta\phi^A}\lambda^A, \tag{A.2}$$

where ϕ^A, ϕ^*_A, λ^A, $\psi(\phi)$ are the respective fields, antifields, Lagrangian multipliers,[7] $\varepsilon(\phi^*_A) = \varepsilon(\lambda^A) = \varepsilon_A + 1$, and the gauge Fermion, which introduces the gauge into the path integral. The quantum action S is subject to a master equation in terms of the antibracket $(\bullet, \bullet) \equiv (\bullet, \bullet)^1$ and the nilpotent Laplacian $\Delta \equiv \Delta^1$ given by (2.8) with $a = 1$:

$$\frac{1}{2}(S, S) = i\hbar\Delta S \iff \Delta \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}S\right) = 0 \text{ for } S|_{\phi^* = \hbar = 0} = S_0(A) \tag{A.3}$$

For vanishing external sources J_A, the integrand in (A.1) or (A.2) is invariant under the finite BRST–BV transformations with a constant Fermionic parameter μ ($\mu^2 = 0$),

$$\Delta_\mu \left(\phi^A, \phi^*_A, \lambda^A\right) = \left(\phi^A \overleftarrow{U}, -\left(\phi^*_A, S\right), 0\right) \mu \equiv \left(\phi^A, \phi^*_A, \lambda^A\right) \overleftarrow{s}\, \mu \,, \tag{A.4}$$

whereas the transformation of the vacuum functional Z_ψ with respect to $(\phi^A, \phi^*_A, \lambda^A) \to (\phi^A, \phi^*_A, \lambda^A) + \Delta_\mu(\phi^A, \phi^*_A, \lambda^A)$, related to finite field-dependent BRST-BV transformations [27] with an arbitrary functional $\mu = \mu(\phi, \lambda)$ is in one-to-one correspondence with a finite change $\psi \to \psi + \psi'$ of the gauge Fermion,

$$\psi'(\phi, \lambda|\mu) = \frac{\hbar}{i}\left[\sum_{n=1} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n}\left(\mu \overleftarrow{U}\right)^{n-1}\right]\mu \,, \tag{A.5}$$

which justifies the gauge-independence of the vacuum functional, $Z_\psi = Z_{\psi+\psi'}$. The relation (A.5) is given by a solution of the so-called compensation equation (implied by the condition $Z_\psi = Z_{\psi+\psi'}$) for an unknown functional ψ', which can be easily obtained from the Jacobian $J = \mathrm{Sdet}\left\|z^{\mathrm{p}}(1 + \overleftarrow{s}\,\mu)\frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta z^{\mathrm{q}}}\right\|$, for $z^{\mathrm{p}} \equiv (\phi^A, \phi^*_A, \lambda^A)$, corresponding to the change of variables [27]

$$\ln\left(1 + \mu\overleftarrow{U}\right) = \frac{i}{\hbar}\psi'\overleftarrow{U} \quad \text{with} \quad J = \left(1 + \mu\overleftarrow{U}\right)^{-1}. \tag{A.6}$$

Considering $\mu(\phi, \lambda)$ as an unknown parameter of the field-dependent BRST–BV transformation (A.4), which realizes $Z_\psi = Z_{\psi+\psi'}$ for a given finite change of the gauge ψ', a solution of (A.6) with accuracy up to $\overleftarrow{U}$-exact terms reads

$$\mu(\phi, \lambda|\psi') = -\frac{i}{\hbar}g(y)\psi' \,, \quad \text{for} \quad y \equiv \frac{i}{\hbar}\psi'\overleftarrow{U} \,, \tag{A.7}$$

with a function $g(y)$ given by (3.4).

Let us now consider a BRST non-invariant Bosonic functional $M_\psi = M_\psi(\phi, \phi^*)$, $M_\psi \overleftarrow{s} \neq 0$, with $\mathrm{gh}(M_\psi) = 0$, which may, or may not, be subject to the so-called condition of soft BRST symmetry breaking [30, 31]

$$(M_\psi, M_\psi) = 0, \ [(M_\psi, M_\psi) = -2i\hbar\Delta M_\psi] \,, \tag{A.8}$$

and is assumed to be such that the path integrals $Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(J)$ and $Z_{M_\psi,\psi} = Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(J)|_{J=0}$,

$$Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(J) = \int d\phi\, d\phi^* d\lambda \, \exp\left\{(i/\hbar)\left[S_M\left(\phi, \phi^*\right) + \left(\phi^*_A\phi^A - \psi(\phi)\right)\overleftarrow{U} + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\}, \text{ for } Z_{0,\psi}(J) = Z_\psi(J), \tag{A.9}$$

with the action

$$S_M = S + M_\psi \,, \ \text{so that } S_{M=0} = S, \tag{A.10}$$

be well-defined in perturbation theory. In this case, we will speak of a *gauge theory with BRST symmetry breaking* and refer to $Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(J)$ in (A.9) as the generating functional of Green's functions with BRST symmetry breaking. It is obvious that the integrand in (A.9) for $J = 0$ is not BRST invariant. However, the gauge independence of the vacuum functional $Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(0)$ can be restored if we suppose that within the reference frame given by the gauge Fermion $\psi + \psi'$

[7] In this Appendix, we use the standard notation [28] for Lagrangian multipliers, which differs from the auxiliary fields λ^A of the opposite Grassmann parity in the basic part of the work.

the BRST symmetry breaking term should have a BRST transformed representation, with $\mu(\psi') = \mu(\phi, \lambda|\psi')$ being a solution (A.7) of the compensation equation (A.6), namely,

$$M_{\psi+\psi'} = M_\psi + \Delta_{\mu(\psi')} M_\psi \,. \tag{A.11}$$

Indeed, a modified Ward identity for $Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(J)$ is easily obtained by making in (A.9) a field-dependent BRST transformation (A.4) and using the relations (A.7) and the expression (A.6) for the Jacobian:

$$\left\langle \left\{ 1 + \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[J_A \phi^A + M_\psi \right] \overleftarrow{U} \mu(\psi') \right\} \left(1 + \mu(\psi') \overleftarrow{U} \right)^{-1} \right\rangle_{M,\psi,J} = 1 \,, \tag{A.12}$$

where the symbol "$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{M,\psi,J}$" for a quantity $\mathcal{O}$ stands for a source-dependent average expectation value with respect to $Z_{M,\psi}(J)$, corresponding to the gauge-fixing ψ. Notice that (A.12) differs from the Ward identity for a gauge theory without BRST symmetry breaking and takes the form, with a constant μ,

$$\left\langle \left[J_A \phi^A + M_\psi \right] \overleftarrow{U} \right\rangle_{M,\psi,J} = 0 \,, \tag{A.13}$$

which is identical, after introducing external antifields ϕ^*_A, to the Ward identity for $Z_{M_\psi,\psi}(J, \phi^*)$ in [26, 30].

The Ward identity (A.12), with allowance made for (A.7) and (A.11), implies an equation which describes the gauge dependence of $Z_{M,\psi}(J)$ for a finite change of the gauge $\psi \to \psi + \psi'$, namely,

$$Z_{M_{\psi+\psi'},\psi+\psi'}(J) - Z_{M,\psi}(J) = Z_{M,\psi}(J) \left\langle \frac{i}{\hbar} J_A \phi^A \overleftarrow{U} \mu\left(\phi, \lambda| - \psi'\right) \right\rangle_{M,\psi,J} . \tag{A.14}$$

As in the case of BRST-antiBRST symmetry (3.12), the relation (A.14) allows one to state, due to the standard arguments of the equivalence theorem [41], that upon the shell determined by $J_A = 0$ a finite change of the generating functional of Green's functions with a broken BRST symmetry term does not depend on a choice of the gauge condition with respect to a finite change of the gauge ($\psi \to \psi + \psi'$). Note, first of all, that this result is in complete agreement with the result of [26] when the total configuration space is determined only by the fields ϕ^A without introducing the internal antifields ϕ^*_A and Lagrangian multipliers λ^A. Second, the same statement can be made for the physical S-matrix. We hope that in the case of a renormalized theory the above property is preserved by a renormalized functional $Z_{M,\psi;R}(J)$ and intend to study this problem in a forthcoming work.

B Effective Average Action in Yang–Mills theories

Here, we apply the concept of BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking to the effective average action in Yang–Mills theories within the functional renormalization group approach (for a review and references, see [37]) to the BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian quantization of Yang–Mills theories.

In this case, the generating functional (2.6), with S being a solution of (2.7), is reduced by integration over $(\phi^*_a, \bar{\phi}, \pi^a, \lambda)$ to $Z_F(J)$ in (3.13), with the BRST-antiBRST quantum action $S_F(\phi)$ in (3.14) invariant under the finite BRST-antiBRST transformations $\phi^A \to \phi^A + \Delta_\lambda \phi^A$ in (3.17). We consider the generating functional of Green's functions extended by external antifields $\widetilde{\phi}^*_a, \widetilde{\bar{\phi}}$ and written without the tilde symbol as $Z_F(J, \widetilde{\phi}^*, \widetilde{\bar{\phi}}) = Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar{\phi})$,

$$Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}) = \int d\phi \ \exp\left\{ \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[\mathcal{S}_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}) + J_A \phi^A \right] \right\}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{S}_F = S_F + \phi^*_{Aa} s^a \phi^A - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\phi}_A s^2 \phi^A \,, \tag{B.1}$$

for $Z_F(J, 0, 0) = Z_F(J)$. The generating functional of vertex Green's functions (effective action) $\Gamma_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi})$ is determined in the BRST-antiBRST quantization [4, 5] by a Legendre transformation of $(\hbar/i) \ln Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar{\phi})$ with respect to the sources J_A:

$$\Gamma_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}) = \frac{\hbar}{i} \ln Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}) - J_A \phi^A \,, \quad \phi^A = \frac{\hbar \delta}{i \delta J_A} \ln Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar{\phi}) \,, \tag{B.2}$$

with J_A expressed in terms of the average fields ϕ^A from $J = -\delta\Gamma_F/\delta\phi$. Note that the non-renormalized quantitiy $\Gamma_F = \Gamma_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar\phi)$ satisfies the usual Ward identities in terms of the extended antibracket:

$$\frac{1}{2}\big(\Gamma_F, \Gamma_F\big)^a + V^a\Gamma_F = 0\,, \tag{B.3}$$

rewritten, by means of (B.2), from the Ward identities for $Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar\phi)$: $\big(J_A\delta/\delta\phi^*_A - V^a\big)Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar\phi) = 0$. For the vanishing $\phi^*_a, \bar\phi$, we also obtain the usual effective action for the Yang–Mills theory in the BRST-antiBRST formalism: $\Gamma_F(\phi, 0, 0) = \Gamma_F(\phi)$. The actions $\Gamma_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar\phi)$ and $\Gamma_F(\phi)$ are invariant under the respective finite BRST-antiBRST transformations of the *average fields*:

$$\Delta_\lambda\big(\phi^A, \phi^*_{Aa}, \bar\phi_A\big) = \Big(\phi^A\left[\exp\big(\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a\big) - 1\right], 0, (-1)^{\varepsilon_A}\bar\phi_A\overleftarrow{V}^a\lambda_a\Big) \;\text{ for }\; (\,\bullet\overleftarrow{s}^a) = \big(\,\bullet, \Gamma_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar\phi)\big)^a \tag{B.4}$$

$$\text{and }\;\; \phi^A \to \check\phi^A = (1 + \Delta_\lambda)\phi^A\big|_{\phi^* = \bar\phi = 0} \Longleftrightarrow \phi^A \to \check\phi^A = \phi^A\exp\big(\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a\big)\big|_{\phi^* = \bar\phi = 0}. \tag{B.5}$$

The finite BRST-antiBRST transformations (B.4), (B.5) are nothing else than the *Lie group transformations* of a field configuration ϕ^A, as compared to the usual infinitesimal BRST-antiBRST transformations determined by the basic element $\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a$ of the Lie algebra. The finite (group) transformations (B.4), albeit with the initial (not average) fields ϕ^A respect the invariance of the integrand in $Z_F(J, \phi^*, \bar\phi)$ for $J = 0$ in (B.1), with account taken of the identity $s^a s^b = (1/2)\,\varepsilon^{ab}s^2$, for $a, b = 1, 2$.

We now extend the functional renormalization group (FRG) construction, earlier applied only in the Lagrangian BRST quantization, to the case of BRST-antiBRST quantization. In doing so, we introduce, instead of Γ_F, the so-called average effective action $\Gamma_{F;k}$ with an external momentum-shell parameter, k, smoothly related to Γ_F,

$$\lim_{k\to 0}\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi, \phi^*, \bar\phi) \;=\; \Gamma_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar\phi), \tag{B.6}$$

in such a way that the action $\mathcal{S}_F(\phi, \phi^*, \bar\phi)$ [for the vanishing antifields, being the action $S_F(\phi)$] in Yang–Mills theories should be extended by BRST-antiBRST symmetry breaking terms, $M_F(\phi)$, having the form of a regulator action, $S_k = S_{F;k}$, being quadratic in the fields $A^i = A^{m\mu}(x)$ and the Sp(2)-doublet of ghost-antighost fields $C^{\alpha a} = C^{ma}(x)$ for $M(\phi) = S_k(\phi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{F;k}(\phi) \;&=\; \frac{1}{2}A^iA^j(R_{F;k})_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ab}(R_{F;k,gh})_{\alpha\beta}C^{\beta b}C^{\alpha a}(-1)^{\varepsilon_\alpha} \\ &=\; \int d^Dx\Big\{\frac{1}{2}A^{m\mu}(x)(R_{F;k})^{mn}_{\mu\nu}(x)A^{\nu n}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ab}C^{ma}(x)(R_{F;k,gh})^{mn}(x)C^{nb}(x)\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

with the Lorentz indices $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, ..., D-1$ of the Minkowsky space $R^{1,D-1}$, the metric $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(+, -, \ldots, -)$, and the indices $m, n, l = 1, \ldots, N^2 - 1$ of the Lie algebra $su(N)$; see also (3.23), (3.24) in Section 3.2. In (B.7), we have specified the condensed notations, so that the regulator quantities $(R_{F;k})$, $(R_{F:k,gh})$ in the reference frame with a gauge Boson F have no dependence on the fields, as well as satisfy the properties $(R_{F;k})_{ij} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j}(R_{F;k})_{ji}$, $(R_{F;k,gh})_{\alpha\beta} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_\beta}(R_{F;k,gh})_{\beta\alpha}$ and vanish as the parameter k tends to zero.

By definition, the regulator action $S_{F;k}$ is not BRST-antiBRST invariant:

$$S_{F;k}\overleftarrow{s}^a = \int d^Dx\left\{A^{m\mu}(R_{F;k})^{mn}_{\mu\nu}D^{\nu nl}C^{la} + \varepsilon_{bc}(R_{F;k,gh})^{mn}C^{mb}\Big(\varepsilon^{ca}B^n - \frac{1}{2}f^{nol}C^{lc}C^{oa}\Big)\right\} \neq 0, \tag{B.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4}S_{F;k}\overleftarrow{s}^2 = \frac{1}{4}\int d^Dx\Big\{&-A^{m\mu}(R_{F;k})^{mn}_{\mu\nu}\Big(2D^{\nu nl}B^l + f^{nlo}C^{oa}D^{\nu lp}C^{pb}\varepsilon_{ba}\Big) + \varepsilon_{ab}D^{\mu mo}C^{oa}(R_{F;k})^{mn}_{\mu\nu}D^{\nu nl}C^{lb} \\ &-2\varepsilon_{ab}C^{ma}(R_{F;k,gh})^{mn}f^{nlo}\Big(B^oC^{lb} + \frac{1}{6}f^{ors}C^{sc}C^{rb}C^{ld}\varepsilon_{dc}\Big) - \varepsilon_{ab}\varepsilon_{cd}\Big(\varepsilon^{ac}B^m + \frac{1}{2}f^{mlo}C^{oc}C^{la}\Big)(R_{F;k,gh})^{mn} \\ &\times\Big(\varepsilon^{bd}B^n + \frac{1}{2}f^{npr}C^{rd}C^{pb}\Big)\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

$$\Longrightarrow\;\; \Delta_\lambda S_{F;k} = S_{F;k}\left[\exp\big(\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a\big) - 1\right], \tag{B.10}$$

where in deriving (B.8), (B.9) we have used the readily established Leibnitz-like properties of the generators of BRST-antiBRST transformations, s^a and s^2, acting on the product of any functionals A, B with definite Grassmann parities:

$$(AB)\overleftarrow{s}^a = (A\overleftarrow{s}^a)\,B\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_B} + A\,(B\overleftarrow{s}^a)\,, \quad (AB)\overleftarrow{s}^2 = \left(A\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)B - 2\,(A\overleftarrow{s}_a)\,(B\overleftarrow{s}^a)\,(-1)^{\varepsilon_B} + A\left(B\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)\,. \quad \text{(B.11)}$$

We define extended generating functionals $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$ of Green's functions coinciding for $k \to 0$ with the respective $Z_F(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$ and $Z_F(J)$ in (B.1), according to (4.1),

$$\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) = \int d\phi\ \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[\mathcal{S}_F(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) + S_{F;k} + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\}. \quad \text{(B.12)}$$

Before taking the limit $k \to 0$, the integrand in (B.12) for $J = 0$ is not BRST-antiBRST invariant due to (B.8)–(B.10), whereas in the limit $k \to 0$ the functionals $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}$ take values coinciding with the usual generating functionals Z_F. The average effective action $\Gamma_{F;k} = \Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$, being the generating functional of vertex functions in the presence of regulators, is introduced according to the rule described by (B.2), namely,

$$\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) = \frac{\hbar}{i}\ln\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) - J_A\phi^A\,, \quad \phi^A = \frac{\hbar\delta}{i\delta J_A}\ln Z_{F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})\,, \quad \text{(B.13)}$$

with the obvious consequences $J = -\delta\Gamma_{F;k}/\delta\phi$, for the Legendre transformation (B.13).

The average effective action satisfies the functional integro-differential equation

$$\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\,\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})\right\} = \int d\varphi\,\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\Big[\mathcal{S}_F(\phi+\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) + S_{F;k}(\phi+\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) - \frac{\delta\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})}{\delta\phi}\,\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi\Big]\right\}, \quad \text{(B.14)}$$

determining the loop expansion $\Gamma_{F;k} = \sum_{n\geq 0}\hbar^n\Gamma_{nF;k}$. Thus, the tree-level (zero-loop) and one-loop approximations of (B.14) correspond to

$$\Gamma_{0F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) \;=\; \mathcal{S}_{F0}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) \;+\; S_{0F;k}(\phi)\,, \quad \text{(B.15)}$$

$$\Gamma_{1F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) \;=\; \mathcal{S}_{F1}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) \;+ S_{1F;k}(\phi) - \frac{i}{2}\ln\mathrm{Sdet}\left\|(\mathcal{S}_{F0} + S_{0F;k})''_{AB}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})\right\|. \quad \text{(B.16)}$$

For the vanishing antifields $\phi^*_a, \bar{\phi}$, (B.14)–(B.16) imply the equation, as well as the zero- and one-loop approximations, for the usual average effective action $\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi) = \Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})|_{\phi^*=\bar{\phi}=0}$ in the BRST-antiBRST quantization.

Concerning the regulator functions, we suppose that they model the non-perturbative contributions to the self-energy part of Feynman diagrams, so that the dependence on the parameter k enables one to extract some additional information about the scale dependence of the theory beyond the loop expansion [36].

The *modified Ward identity*, or the *Slavnov–Taylor identities*, for the functionals $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$ and $\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi)$ are readily obtained from the general result (4.3) and have the form, for $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$,

$$\left\langle\left\{1 + \frac{i}{\hbar}\left[J_A\phi^A + S_{F;k}\right]\left[\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a(\Lambda) + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\lambda^2(\Lambda)\right] - \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}\right)^2\left[J_A\phi^A + S_{F;k}\right]\overleftarrow{s}^a\left[J_B\phi^B + S_{F;k}\right]\overleftarrow{s}_a\lambda^2(\Lambda)\right\}\right.$$
$$\left.\times\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^{-2}\right\rangle_{F;k,J} = 1\,, \quad \text{(B.17)}$$

with the source-dependent average expectation value corresponding to the gauge-fixing $F(\phi)$ with respect to $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$:

$$\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle_{F;k,J} = Z^{-1}_{F;k}(J)\int d\phi\ \mathcal{O}(\phi)\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[S_F(\phi) + S_{F;k} + J_A\phi^A\right]\right\}\,, \quad \text{for} \quad \langle 1\rangle_{F;k,J} = 1\,. \quad \text{(B.18)}$$

In (B.17), we have taken account of the fact that if in some reference frame with a gauge Boson $F(\phi)$ the regulator action has the form $S_{F;k}$ then in a different reference frame determined by a gauge Boson $(F+\Delta F)(\phi)$ it should be calculated in accordance with (4.4) and (B.8)–(B.10) as follows:

$$S_{F+\Delta F;k} = (1 + \Delta_{\lambda(\Delta F)})S_{F;k} = S_{F;k}\exp\left(\overleftarrow{s}^a\lambda_a(\Delta F)\right). \quad \text{(B.19)}$$

For constant λ_a, the identity (B.17) decomposes in powers of λ_a and assumes the form of two independent and one dependent (at λ^2) identities identical to (4.6), (4.7), where the substitution $(M_F, \overleftarrow{U}^a, \langle ... \rangle_{M,F,J}) \to (S_{F;k}, \overleftarrow{s}^a, \langle ... \rangle_{F;k,J})$ has to be made.

For the average effective action $\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi)$, the modified Ward identity (B.17) takes the form

$$\left\langle \left\langle \left\{ 1 + \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[-\frac{\delta \Gamma_{F;k}}{\delta \phi^A} \phi^A + S_{F;k} \right] \left[\overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a(\Lambda) + \frac{1}{4} \overleftarrow{s}^2 \lambda^2(\Lambda) \right] - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \right)^2 \left[-\frac{\delta \Gamma_{F;k}}{\delta \phi^A} \phi^A + S_{F;k} \right] \overleftarrow{s}^a \right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. \times \left[-\frac{\delta \Gamma_{F;k}}{\delta \phi^B} \phi^B + S_{F;k} \right] \overleftarrow{s}_a \lambda^2(\Lambda) \right\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda(\phi) \overleftarrow{s}^2 \right)^{-2} \right\rangle \Big\rangle_{F;k,\phi} = 1 \,, \tag{B.20}$$

where the operators $\overleftarrow{s}^a$, $\overleftarrow{s}^2$ do not act on $\delta \Gamma_{F;k}/\delta \phi$, and $\langle\langle ... \rangle\rangle_{F;k,\phi}$ denotes the average expectation value corresponding to a gauge-fixing $F(\phi)$ with respect to $\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi)$.

Repeating the arguments of Section 4 and using the results for the Yang–Mills theory in the gauge dependence problem (3.22) of Section 3.2, we obtain a relation which describes the gauge dependence of $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$ for a finite change of the gauge $F \to F + \Delta F$, with account taken of (3.5) and (B.19). Specified below in (B.22) for the Yang–Mills theory [1], the equality (B.17) implies a relation which describes the gauge dependence of $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J)$ with a finite change of the gauge $F \to F + \Delta F$:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{F+\Delta F;k}(J) - \mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J) = \mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J) \left\langle \frac{i}{\hbar} J_A \phi^A \left[\overleftarrow{s}^a \lambda_a \left(\phi | - \Delta F \right) + \frac{1}{4} \overleftarrow{s}^2 \lambda^2 \left(\phi | - \Delta F \right) \right] \right.$$
$$\left. - (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \left(\frac{i}{2\hbar} \right)^2 J_B J_A \left(\phi^A \overleftarrow{s}^a \right) \left(\phi^B \overleftarrow{s}_a \right) \lambda^2 \left(\phi | - \Delta F \right) \right\rangle_{F;k,J} , \tag{B.21}$$

where

$$\lambda_a \left(\phi | - \Delta F \right) = -\frac{1}{2i\hbar} \left[\Delta F \overleftarrow{s}_a \right] \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(n+1)!} \left(\frac{1}{4i\hbar} \Delta F \overleftarrow{s}^2 \right)^n . \tag{B.22}$$

From (B.21) it follows that upon the shell determined by $J_A = 0$ a finite change of the generating functional of Green's functions with a BRST-antiBRST-non-invariant regulator action S_k does not depend on a choice of the gauge condition with respect to a finite change of the gauge, $F \to F + \Delta F$, for any value of the external momentum-shell parameter k.

For the extended generating functional $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J, \phi^*, \bar{\phi})$, the finite (group) BRST-antiBRST transformations $\phi^A \to \check{\phi}^A = \phi^A \exp\left(\overleftarrow{s}_a \lambda_a \right)$ in (B.4) within the sector of fields ϕ^A for an arbitrary functional $\lambda_a(\phi) = \Lambda(\phi) \overleftarrow{s}_a$ result in the modified Ward identity

$$\left\{ \left[J_A + \widehat{S}_{F;k\,A} \right] \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^*_{Aa}} \widehat{\lambda}_a(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{\phi}_A} \widehat{\lambda}^2(\Lambda) \right] - V^a \widehat{\lambda}_a(\Lambda) - \frac{\varepsilon_{ab}}{4} \left\{ \left[\left[J_A + \widehat{S}_{F;k\,A} \right] \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^*_{Aa}} - V^a \right] \right.\right. \tag{B.23}$$
$$\left.\left. \times \left[\left[J_B + \widehat{S}_{F;k\,B} \right] \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^*_{Bb}} - V^b \right] \widehat{\lambda}^2(\Lambda) \right\} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{ab}}{2} \widehat{\Lambda}_{,BA} \frac{\hbar\, \delta}{i \delta \phi^*_{Ab}} \frac{\hbar\, \delta}{i \delta \phi^*_{Ba}} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A + 1} + \widehat{\Lambda}_{,A} \frac{\hbar\, \delta}{i \delta \bar{\phi}_A} \right)^{-2} \mathcal{Z}_{F;k,J} = 0 \,,$$

where the notation for $\widehat{S}_{F;k\,A}$, $\widehat{\lambda}_a$, $\widehat{\Lambda}_{,A}$, $\widehat{\Lambda}_{,BA}$ is given by

$$\widehat{S}_{F;k,\,A} = \frac{\delta S_{F;k}(\phi)}{\delta \phi^A} \Big|_{\phi \to \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J}} , \quad \widehat{\lambda}_a = \lambda_a(\phi) \big|_{\phi \to \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J}} , \quad \widehat{\Lambda}_{,BA} = \frac{\delta^2 \Lambda(\phi)}{\delta \phi^B \delta \phi^A} \Big|_{\phi \to \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J}} . \tag{B.24}$$

For constant λ_a, the identity (B.23) decomposes in powers of λ_a and takes the form of two independent (at λ_a) Ward identities:

$$\widehat{q}^a \mathcal{Z}_{F;k,J} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \widehat{q}^a = \left[J_A + \widehat{S}_{F;k\,A} \right] \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^*_{Aa}} - V^a , \tag{B.25}$$

with anticommuting $\widehat{q}^a$: $\widehat{q}^a\widehat{q}^b + \widehat{q}^b\widehat{q}^a = 0$, whereas at λ^2 the corresponding Ward identity is implied automatically by (B.25), due to

$$\frac{\varepsilon_{ab}}{4}\widehat{q}^a\widehat{q}^b = -\frac{1}{2}\left[J_A + \widehat{S}_{F;kA}\right]\frac{\delta}{\delta\bar{\phi}_A}\,. \tag{B.26}$$

For the extended average effective action $\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$ in (B.13), the *modified Ward identity* depending on the odd-valued functionally-dependent functionals $\lambda_a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a$ can be derived from (B.23) in a way similar to the trick in [30, 26] within the BRST Lagrangian quantization; however, in view of a non-linear character of the identity (B.23) it is cumbersome and deserves a special analysis. The identities (B.25) for $\Gamma_{F;k}(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$ are readily obtained,

$$\frac{1}{2}\big(\Gamma_{F;k},\Gamma_{F;k}\big)^a + V^a\Gamma_{F;k} - S_{F;kA}(\widehat{\phi})\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}}\Gamma_{F;k} = 0\,, \tag{B.27}$$

and coincide in the limit $k\to 0$ with (B.3) for the usual effective action $\Gamma_F(\phi,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$. Here, the quantities $S_{F;kA}(\widehat{\phi})$ for the operator-valued fields $\widehat{\phi}^A$ are given by

$$S_{F;k,\,A}(\widehat{\phi}) = \frac{\delta S_{F;k}(\phi)}{\delta\phi^A}\big|_{\phi\to\widehat{\phi}}\,,\quad \text{with}\quad \widehat{\phi}^A = \phi^A + i\hbar\,(\Gamma^{''-1}_{F;k})^{AB}\frac{\delta_l}{\delta\phi^B},\quad \text{for}\quad (\Gamma^{''-1}_{F;k})^{AC}(\Gamma^{''}_{F;k})_{CB} = \delta^A_{\ B}, \tag{B.28}$$

and $(\Gamma^{''}_{F;k})_{AB} = \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\phi^A}\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi^B}\Gamma_{F;k}$.

Finally, a relation which describes the gauge dependence of the extended functional $\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi})$ for a finite change of the gauge $F\to F+\Delta F$ with $\lambda_a\,(\phi|-\Delta F)$ (B.22) follows from (B.23) with account taken of (B.24):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}_{F+\Delta F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) - \mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J\phi^*,\bar{\phi}) = \Bigg\{ J_A\left[\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}}\widehat{\lambda}_a\,(-\Delta F) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\delta}{\delta\bar{\phi}_A}\widehat{\lambda}^2\,(-\Delta F)\right] - V^a\widehat{\lambda}_a\,(-\Delta F)\\ -\ \frac{\varepsilon_{ab}}{4}\left[J_A\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi^*_{Aa}} - V^a\right]\left[J_B\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi^*_{Bb}} - V^b\right]\widehat{\lambda}^2\,(-\Delta F)\Bigg\}\,\mathcal{Z}_{F;k}(J,\phi^*,\bar{\phi}).\end{aligned} \tag{B.29}$$

From (B.29) it follows that upon the shell determined by $J_A = 0$ on the hypersurface $\phi^*_{Aa} = 0$ a finite change of the extended generating functional with a BRST-antiBRST not-invariant regulator action S_k does not depend on a choice of the gauge condition with respect to a finite change of the gauge, $F\to F+\Delta F$, for any value of the external momentum-shell parameter k.

The consistency of the FRG method, based on the introduction of (B.8), means that the values $\Gamma_{F;k}$, $\Gamma_{F+\Delta F;k}$ of the effective average actions calculated in two different gauges determined by χ^a and $\chi^a+\Delta\chi^a$ (see [1, 4] for details), corresponding to the gauge functionals F and $F+\Delta F$, should coincide with each other on the mass shell of vanishing antifields ϕ^*_{Aa} for any value of the parameter k, i.e., along the FRG trajectory, but not only at its boundary points. For completeness, the form of the FRG flow equation for $\Gamma_{F;k}$ that describes the FRG trajectory (formally identical with the one in [35]), with allowance for the notation $\partial_t = k\frac{d}{dk}$, reads

$$\partial_t\Gamma_{F;k} \,=\, \partial_t S_{F;k} \,-\, \frac{\hbar}{i}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\,\partial_t(R_{F;k})^{mn}_{\mu\nu}\left(\Gamma^{''-1}_{F;k}\right)^{(m\mu)(n\nu)} \,+\, \partial_t(R_{F;k,gh})^{mn}\left(\Gamma^{''-1}_{F;k}\right)^{mn}\right\} \tag{B.30}$$

and has the same form for the ϕ^*_{Aa}- and $\bar{\phi}_A$-independent part of $\Gamma_{F;k}$, due to the parametric dependence on $\phi^*_{Aa},\bar{\phi}_A$ for all the terms in (B.30).

Let us consider a specific choice of the initial Bosonic gauge functional $F = F_\xi$ from the F_ξ-family of gauge-fixing functionals $F_\xi = F_\xi\,(A,C)$, corresponding to the R_ξ-like gauge introduced [1] in the BRST-antiBRST Lagrangian quantization

$$F_\xi = \frac{1}{2}\int d^Dx\,\left(-A^m_\mu A^{m\mu} + \frac{\xi}{2}\varepsilon_{ab}C^{ma}C^{mb}\right), \tag{B.31}$$

$$F_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\int d^Dx\,A^m_\mu A^{m\mu}\quad\text{and}\quad F_1 \,=\, \frac{1}{2}\int d^Dx\,\left(-A^m_\mu A^{m\mu} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ab}C^{ma}C^{mb}\right), \tag{B.32}$$

where the gauge-fixing functional $F_{(0)}\,(A)$ induces the contribution $S_{F_0;k}$ to the quantum action that arises in the case of the Landau gauge $\chi(A)=\partial^\mu A^m_\mu=0$, whereas the functional $F_1\,(A,C)$ corresponds to the Feynman (covariant) gauge $\chi(A,B)=\partial^\mu A^m_\mu+(1/2)\,B^m=0$. The parameters $\lambda_a(\phi|\Delta F(\xi))=s_a\Lambda$ of a finite field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformation that connects an R_ξ gauge with an $R_{\xi+\Delta\xi}$ gauge, according to (B.22), have the form

$$\lambda_a(\phi|\Delta F_\xi)=\frac{\Delta\xi}{4i\hbar}\varepsilon_{ab}\int d^Dx\;B^nC^{nb}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\left[\frac{\Delta\xi}{4i\hbar}\int d^Dy\;\left(B^uB^u-\frac{1}{24}\;f^{uwt}f^{trs}C^{sc}C^{rp}C^{wd}C^{uq}\varepsilon_{cd}\varepsilon_{pq}\right)\right]^n, \tag{B.33}$$

where allowance has been made for $\Delta F=\Delta F_\xi$,

$$\Delta F_\xi\;\;=\;\;F_{\xi+\Delta\xi}-F_\xi=\frac{\Delta\xi}{4}\varepsilon_{ab}\int d^Dx\;C^{ma}C^{mb}, \tag{B.34}$$

as well as for $\Delta F_\xi{}^{\overleftarrow{s}\,a}$ and $\Delta F_\xi{}^{\overleftarrow{s}\,2}$,

$$\Delta F_\xi{}^{\overleftarrow{s}\,a}=\frac{\Delta\xi}{2}\varepsilon_{bc}\int d^Dx\;\varepsilon^{ca}B^mC^{mb}\;, \tag{B.35}$$

$$\Delta F_\xi{}^{\overleftarrow{s}\,2}=2\int d^Dx\left\{\left[\left(\partial^\mu A^m_\mu\right)+\frac{\xi}{2}B^m\right]B^m+\frac{1}{2}\left(\partial^\mu C^{ma}\right)D^{mn}_\mu C^{nb}\varepsilon_{ab}-\frac{\xi}{48}\;f^{mnl}f^{lrs}C^{sa}C^{rc}C^{nb}C^{md}\varepsilon_{ab}\varepsilon_{cd}\right\}. \tag{B.36}$$

Now, with account taken of the representation (B.19) for the regulator action $S_{F_\xi;k}$ in the $R_{\xi+\Delta\xi}$-gauge, one can find its form in a manner respecting the gauge-independence problem described by (B.21), (B.29) once $S_{F_\xi+\Delta F_\xi;k}$ is explicitly calculated by the rule

$$S_{F_\xi+\Delta F_\xi;k}=S_{F_\xi;k}\exp\left[\overleftarrow{s}{}^a\lambda_a(\Delta F_\xi)\right], \tag{B.37}$$

with allowance for (B.8)–(B.10).

The result given by (B.21) and (B.29) implies a statement consistent with [26] (as well as a different statement in comparison with [35] for BRST symmetry), i.e., on the gauge-dependence of the average effective action, and therefore also on the consistency of its introduction in Lagrangian quantization for any value of the parameter k. Indeed, the explicit gauge dependence of the vacuum functional $Z_{k,\chi}$ and of the average effective action Γ_k on their extremals in [35] was shown respectively by Eqs. (4.12) and (5.9) therein. At the same time, the gauge independence of the average effective action in [35] was achieved on the mass-shell determined in a larger space of fields (see Eqs. (6.31), (6.32) therein) with the subsidiary conditions $L=0$, by consideration of the regulators S_k as composite fields ($S_k\to LS_k$), however, without taking into account the change of the regulators S_k under the change of the gauge condition in Eqs. (6.22), (6.27), (6.30), (6.31). In this respect, note that the consideration of the regulators as composite fields, following the approach [38] (see the remarks at the end of Sect. 4), allows one to provide the gauge independence of Γ_k on the mass shell given by the usual average fields ϕ^A alone.

References

[1] P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, *Field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations in Yang-Mills and Gribov-Zwanziger theories*, Nucl. Phys. B 888C (2014) 92-128, arXiv:1405.0790 [hep-th] .

[2] P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, *Field-dependent BRST-antiBRST transformations in generalized Hamiltonian formalism*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A (2014), arXiv:1405.7549[hep-th].

[3] P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, *Finite BRST-antiBRST transformations in Lagrangian formalism*, arXiv:1406.0179[hep-th].

[4] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, *Covariant quantization of gauge theories in the framework of extended BRST symmetry*, J. Math. Phys. 31 (1990) 1487.

[5] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, *An Sp(2)-covariant quantization of gauge theories with linearly dependent generators*, J. Math. Phys. 32 (1991) 532.

[6] C.M. Hull, *The BRST-anti-BRST invariant quantization of general gauge theories*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A**5** (1990) 1871.

[7] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, *Extended BRST quantization of gauge theories in generalized canonical formalism*, J. Math. Phys. 31 (1990) 6.

[8] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, *An Sp(2)-covariant version of generalized canonical quantization of dynamical systems with linearly dependent constraints*, J. Math. Phys. 31 (1990) 2708.

[9] P. Gregoire and M. Henneaux, *Hamiltonian BRST-anti-BRST theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. 157 (1993) 279.

[10] V.N. Gribov, *Quantization of nonabelian gauge theories*, Nucl. Phys. B139 (1978) 1.

[11] D. Zwanziger, *Action from the Gribov horizon*, Nucl. Phys. B321 (1989) 591;
Local and renormalizable action from the Gribov horizon, Nucl. Phys. B323 (1989) 513.

[12] C. Becchi, A. Rouet and R. Stora, *The Abelian Higgs-Kibble, unitarity of the S-operator*, Phys. Lett. B52 (1974) 344; *Renormalization of Gauge Theories*, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 98 (1976) 287.

[13] I.V. Tyutin, *Gauge invariance in field theory and ststistical mechanics,* Lebedev Inst. preprint No. 39 (1975) [arXiv:0812.0580[hep-th]].

[14] S.D. Joglekar and B.P. Mandal, *Finite field dependent BRS transformations*, Phys. Rev. D51 (1995) 1919.

[15] G. Curci and R. Ferrari, *Slavnov transformation and supersymmetry*, Phys. Lett. B63 (1976) 91;
I. Ojima, *Another BRS transformation*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 64 (1980) 625.

[16] L. Alvarez-Gaume and L. Baulieu, *The two quantum symmetries associated with a classical symmetry*, Nucl. Phys. B212 (1983) 255.

[17] S. Hwang, *Properties of the anti-BRS symmetry in a general framework*, Nucl. Phys. B231 (1984) 386.

[18] S. Upadhyay, S.K. Rai and B.P. Mandal, *Off-Shell Nilpotent Finite BRST/Anti-BRST Transformations*, J. Math. Phys. 52 (2011) 022301, arXiv:1002.1373hep-th].

[19] S. Upadhyay and B.P. Mandal, *Field dependent nilpotent symmetry for gauge theories*, Eur.Phys.J. C72 (2012) 2065, arXiv:1201.0084[hep-th].

[20] P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, in preparation.

[21] L.D. Faddeev and V.N. Popov, *Feynman diagrams for the Yang-Mills field*, Phys. Lett. B25 (1967) 29.

[22] E.S. Fradkin and G.A. Vilkovisky, *Quantization of relativistic systems with constraints*, Phys. Lett. B55 (1975) 224;
I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, *Relativistic S-matrix of dynamical systems with boson and fermion constraints*, Phys. Lett. B69 (1977) 309.

[23] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, *A generalized canonical formalism and quantization of reducible gauge theories*, Phys. Lett. B122 (1983) 157.

[24] M. Henneaux, *Hamiltonian form of the path integral for theories with a gauge freedom*, Phys. Pep. 126 (1985) 1.

[25] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, *A systematic study of finite BRST-BFV Transformations in generalized Hamiltonian formalism*, DOI: 10.1142/S0217751X14501279, arXiv:1404.4154[hep-th].

[26] A. Reshetnyak, *On gauge independence for gauge models with soft breaking of BRST Symmetry*, arXiv:1312.2092[hep-th].

[27] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov, I.V. Tyutin, *A systematic study of finite BRST-BV transformations in field-antifield formalism*, arXiv:1405.2621[hep-th].

[28] I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, *Gauge algebra and quantization*, Phys. Lett. B102 (1981) 27; *Quantization of gauge thories with linearly dependent generators*, Phys. Rev. D28 (1983) 2567.

[29] P. Lavrov and O. Lechtenfeld, *Field-dependent BRST transformations in Yang-Mills theory*, Phys. Lett. B725 (2013) 382-385, arXiv:1305.0712[hep-th].

[30] P. Lavrov, O. Lechtenfeld and A. Reshetnyak, *Is soft breaking of BRST symmetry consistent?*, JHEP 1110 (2011) 043, arXiv:1108.4820 [hep-th].

[31] P. Lavrov, O. Radchenko and A. Reshetnyak, *Soft breaking of BRST symmetry and gauge dependence*, MPLA A27 (2012) 1250067, arXiv:1201.4720 [hep-th].

[32] P.M. Lavrov, S.D. Odintsov, A.A. Reshetnyak, *Effective action of composite fields for general gauge theories in BLT covariant formalism*, J. Math. Phys. 38 (1997) 3466, [arXiv:hep-th/9604061].

[33] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, *Average action for the Higgs model with abelian gauge symmetry,* Nucl. Phys. B391 (1993) 147.

[34] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, *Effective average action for gauge theories and exact evolution equations,* Nucl. Phys. B417 (1994) 181.

[35] P. Lavrov and I.Shapiro, *On the Functional Renormalization Group approach for Yang-Mills fields*, JHEP, 1306 (2013) 086, [arXiv:1212.2577[hep-th]].

[36] J. Polchinski, *Renormalization and effective lagrangians,* Nucl. Phys. B231 (1984) 269 .

[37] H. Gies, *Introduction to the functional RG and applications to gauge theories*, Lect. Notes Phys. 852 (2012) 287-348; hep-ph/0611146.

[38] A. Reshetnyak, *On composite fields approach to Gribov copies elimination in Yang-Mills theories*, Phys.Part.Nucl. 11 (2014) 1-4, arXiv:1402.3060[hep-th].

[39] R.F. Sobreiro and S.P. Sorella, *A study of the Gribov copies in linear covariant gauges in Euclidean Yang-Mills theories*, JHEP 0506 (2005) 054, arXiv:hep-th/0506165;
D. Dudal, M.A.L. Capri, J.A. Gracey et al., *Gribov ambiguities in the maximal Abelian gauge*, Braz. J. Phys. 37 (2007) 320, arXiv:1210.5651[hep-th];
M.A.L. Capri, A.J. Gómes, M.S. Guimaraes, V.E.R. Lemes, S.P. Sorella, D.G. Tedesko, *A remark on the BRST symmetry in the Gribov-Zwanzider theory*, Phys. Rev. D82 (2010) 105019, arXiv:1009.4135 [hep-th].

[40] F. Canfora, A.J. Gómez, S.P. Sorella and D. Vercauteren, *Study of Yang-Mills-Chern-Simons theory in presence of the Gribov horizon*, arXiv:1312.3308 [hep-th];
M.A.L. Capri, D.R. Granado, M.S. Guimaraes et al., *Implementing the Gribov-Zwanziger framework in N=1 Super Yang-Mills in the Landau gauge*, arXiv:1404.2573 [hep-th].

[41] R.E. Kallosh and I.V. Tyutin, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* 17 (1973) 98;
I.V. Tyutin, *Once again on the equiavalence theorem*, hep-th/0001050.

[42] P.M. Lavrov, P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, *Irreducible gauge theories in the framework of the Sp(2)-covariant quantization method*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A11 (1996) 3097, hep-th/9503197.

[43] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, *A systematic study of finite field dependent BRST-BV transformations in Sp(2) extended field-antifield formalism*, arXiv:1406.4695[hep-th].

[44] P.M. Lavrov, P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, *Superfield formulation of the Lagrangian BRST quantization method*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A10 (1995) 2687, hep-th/9507104.